

SATAN Dis-Rob'd.

From his *Disguise of Light:*

O R,

The *Quakers* Last Shift to Cover their Monstrous
Heresies, Laid Fully open.

I N

A R E P L Y

T O

Thomas Ellwood's **A N S W E R**

(Published the End of Last Month)

T O

George Keith's
N A R R A T I V E

O F T H E

Proceedings at *Turners-Hall*, June 11. 1696.

Which also may serve for a **R E P L Y** (as to the
main Points of *Doctrine*) to **GEO. WHITEHEAD's** An-
swer to *The Snake in the Grass*; to be published the End of
next Month, if this prevent it not.

By the Author of *The Snake in the Grass*.

*They shall make their own Tongues to fall upon themselves: All
that see them shall flee away, Psal. LXIV. 8.*

L O N D O N: Printed for C. Brome at the Gun near the West End
of St. Paul's; W. Kestelbrite at the Swan in St. Paul's Church-
Yard; and H. Hindmarsh at the Golden Ball over-against the Royal
Exchange in Cornhill. 1697.

SA T A N D I R O P D

From the Library of Light

A R E P Y

Thomas Ellwood, A N S W E R

(Translated the End of 1711)

George Keith
N A R R A T I V E

O F T H E

Proceedings in the Court of the
Venerable and Reverend
and Learned Doctors, as GEO. KEITH, and
in the Court of the Lord, as he published the End of
the Month, in the present month.

by the Author of The State in the Court
They will make their own Targers to fall upon themselves: All
that for these shall be as, 1711, LXXIV.
To the Hon. the Council, and the Hon. the Court of the
Hon. the Council, and the Hon. the Court of the
Hon. the Council, and the Hon. the Court of the
Hon. the Council, and the Hon. the Court of the

TO THE

READER.

1. **T**His Reply is short in Comparison of the Answer, which consists of 232 pages. Yet I think is Full, as having omitted nothing that is material.

2. I have undertaken this Task, neither out of Pique or Favour to either of the Parties herein Engag'd; but only so far as the Christian Religion is concern'd between them. And therefore (as I have Caution'd, Sect. 1, Num. VII.) This is not meant as a Defence of Geo. Keith, any further than he Defends the Truth of the Christian Faith. For which Reason I have wholly omitted All the Personal Reflections cast upon him; and the Contradictions which Tho. Ellwood pretends to find in his former Books (while he was a Quaker of their Communion) to the Doctrines which he now sets up in Opposition to them. For since he has in his Narrative, acknowledged some Errors in his former Books, and promised a Retraction of them; we may have Patience till we see what those Errors are which he will confess. In the mean time we must acknowledge, That he having had an Academic Education, and more Learning than is ordinary among

To the Reader.

mong the Quakers, has, by the blessing of God, Improv'd it to so good Purpose, as to discover those very gross Errors among them, which till of late, lay bidden from the Eyes of the World.

E N T O Y

3. Those Errors in their Faith and Doctrine, which I have set down in The Snake in the Grass, I have taken out of their most Approved Books, especially of George Fox, the Head and Founder of their Order. And I have been very Punctual in my Quotations; Else I should have heard of it before this time.

Now this Answer of T. Ellwood, tho it be not to The Snake, yet it is to the Chief Heresies therein objected. And this being the Defence they have to make, if it prove Sophistical, Evasive and Unsound (for which I Refer to what follows) this will wind up the Controversy, and leave no Room to the Quakers but only for Repentance, and a Full and Free Acknowledgment of their Errors, which have kept them so long Divided from the whole Catholick Church, to the Dreadful Peril of their Souls.

I wish from my Heart that this may be the Answer they will Return. But if otherwise, I hope they will not tarry so long a time to do it as in Answering The Snake.

And I desire that they may not Count me an Enemy because I tell them the Truth.

E R R A T A.

Pag. 15. l. 7. for *the* No. p. 17. l. 21. for *to*, p. 18. l. 10. for *Adversary*, p. 23. l. 1. for *ancient*, p. 25. l. 1. for *Son*, p. 27. l. 13. dele *and* and instead of it. So was not Christ's Sacrifice completed by his Death, but by His Blood afterwards shed, p. 28. l. 12. for T. G. r. T. E. s.

In the Gleanings. Pag. 8. l. 21. r. he Prov'd, p. 12. l. 3. for *Piously*, r. *Impiously*.

A FULL REPLY

to *Thomas Ellwood's Answer, &c.*

Section 1.

I. **T**hat which makes this Reply so short, is, only by cutting off the Frivolous and Impertinent Digressions, by which T. E. seeks either to *Tire* or *Divert* the Reader from the main stress of the Contest betwixt G. K. and the other Quakers, which is their *Heretical and Blasphemous Doctrines*: And this will make my Reply the more Full for being so Short; by letting the Reader have a fair View of the Controversie, without Interruption or Confusion.

He spends the first 23 pages in Excusing their not coming to Defend themselves at *Turners-Hall*, as p. 11. because of *The King's absence. Want of Trade. Scarcity of Current Money.* Which ^{Reply to the first 23 pages.} might have occasioned a *Mobb, &c.* And p. 20. That G. K. did not give Notice what *Weapon* he intended to use, and of *what Length*, that they might have provided themselves accordingly. *i.e.* That he did not, in the short *Advertisement*, of half a Sheet, which he printed to give Notice of that Meeting, set down all the *Books and Quotations* which he intended to produce against them.

II. But, to come to the Business, T. E. p. 26. Justifies this Reasoning of *George Whitehead's*. Who calls it *Non-sense*, to tell of God being Co-Creator with the Father, or that God had Glory with God. Does not this imply two Gods, and that God had a Father? Let the Reader judge, says he. Now T. E. would makes us believe that G. W. in all this, Quarrell'd only with the Particle *Co*, which signifies *with*, viz. That, the Word was Creator jointly with the Father.

Ans. 1. Then, by this, T. E. yields that G. W. did not believe that the Word was a Creator with the Father. 2. This is the very Language of Scripture, *John 1. 1.* The Word was with God, and that All things were made by Him. 3. It is G. W's own Language, as quoted by T. E. p. 32. The Word, in the Beginning and with the Father, in His Glory before the world began. Therefore G. W. found no Fault with the Particle *Co*, or *with*, because he uses it himself 4. G. W's Reasoning proceeds further than the Particle *Co*, for he argues, that God, that is, the Word, could not have a Father, and that this would imply Two Gods. p. 27. T. E. quotes G. W. saying again, To tell of the word God, Co-Creator with the Father, is all one as to tell of God being Co-Creator with God, if the Father be

be God; and this is to make Two Gods; Two Creators, &c. By which it is undeniable that he did not allow the *Word* to be God, or to have a *Father*.

T. E. after this, quotes several Passages out of other Books of G. W's owning the *Divinity of Christ*. But these (if sincerely meant) are no *Explanation*, but a *Flat Contradiction* to this. Therefore, let these *Quakers* De-tract their *Heresies* and *Blasphemies*, that is all that is desired of them.

But, in the next place, it would be inquir'd what they mean by ascribing *Divinity* to *Christ*, or the *Word*. This is the Way to Reconcile these Contradictions. And, intruth, I cannot find that they mean, by it, any *Distinction* from the *Father*, otherwise than as the *Sabellians* held, a *Distinct Operation* or *Manifestation* of the *Father*. *Christ* is not *Distinct*

from the *Father*, says George Fox, and They (the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*) are not *Distinct*. And he opposes *Chr. Wade* for saying, that God the *Father* never took upon him *Humane Nature* (but the *Son*, as *Chr. Wade* words it) and quotes against it, that Text where *Christ* is called

The Everlasting Father. So that herein they join with those *Old Hereticks* the *Patristians*, and with *Muggleton*, who say, that it was God the *Father* who was *Incarnate* and *Dyed*. And they cannot think otherwise, if they believe the *Word* to be nothing else but a *Distinct Operation* or *Manifestation* of the *Father*, and so but *Nominally* Different from Him; as some of them do express it; for an *Operation* or *Manifestation* can neither be *Incarnate* or *Dye*.

III. The next *Heresie* of G. W's and the *Quakers*, which T. E. defends, is that against the *Incarnation* of *Christ*, in making *Christ* or the *Word* to have assum'd an *Humane Body*, only as a *Vail* or a *Garment*, wherein He dwelt for a time, as *Angels*, when they appear'd in *Bodies*; but Deny (with the *Socinians*) that He really became a *Man*, by taking our *Nature* into His own *Person*; and therefore say that He had not an *Humane Soul*, tho' He dwelt in an *Humane Body*. For this G. K. produc'd this passage out of a Book of G. W's, which T. E. owns, and Repeats p. 33. viz. If the *Body* and *Soul* of the *Son* of God were, Both, *Created*, doth not this render him a *Fourth Person*? In excuse of this, T. E. supposes that he, in answer to whom G. W. wrote this (one T. Danson, a *Presbyterian Preacher*) did hold that *Christ* had a *Created Soul* from *Eternity*: and upon that Supposition, that G. W. brought this as an *Absurdity* following from *Danson's* Position; that this would infer a *Fourth Person* in the *Divinity*. Now this is so gross a *Prevarication*, that not only no *Presbyterian*, but no *Christian*, ever held that *Christ's created Soul* was from *Eternity*: It is a *Contradiction*; for if it was *created*, it could not be from *Eternity*. And therefore such a Pretence as this, is downright pleading *Guilty*. But shews the true *Quaker Doctrine*, that *Christ* had no *Human Soul*; and consequently that He was not truly a *Man*. For proof of which, this Quotation of G. K's was most Pertinent; and T. E's Answer confirms it much more.

IV. G. K. brought another Proof to shew, that G. W. do's not acknowledge that *Christ has now the Body of a Man*; or will come in that *Body*, to Judge the World. T. E. repeats the Words of G. W. p. 37. *Do'st thou look for Christ as he was Son of Mary, to appear outwardly, in a Bodily Existence to save thee? if thou do'st, thou may'st look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt see such an Appearance of him.* This George Whitehead wrote against one Robert Gordon; and says T. Ellwood, pag 38. *If he be Dead, his Eyes may be already dropt out, without seeing it.* This was spoke like *Merry Andrew*. Why? did Robert Gordon pretend that the Last Judgment should come before he Dyed? was that the Dispute betwixt him and G. W? No. Their Dispute was concerning *Christ's coming*, in His *Human Body*, to the Last Judgment; and T. E. do's not pretend to the Contrary. And therefore this Childish put off, as it is an Affront to his Readers, so is it a Total yielding up the Cause; and that in the most Shameful Manner. As is his other Excuse, that that coming to Judgment was not to *save us*; for the Contest was not for what End He came; But whether He would come or not? None ever said, that the *Saints* were not *saved*, that is, *justified*, and in *Bliss*, before the Day of Judgment; yet the *Full and Compleat Consummation* of their Bliss, in the Re-Union of *Soul and Body*, and Perfect Happiness, will not be till then; which is the Ultimate and Compleat Salvation.

V. The next Quotation out of G. W's Books, is p. 39. in these words, *And that he (Christ) existeth outwardly Bodily, without us, at God's Right hand: what Scripture-proof hath he for these Words? and then what and where is God's Right hand? Is it Visible or Invisible? within us, or without us only? And is Christ the Saviour, as an outward Bodily Existence or Person without us, Distinct from God, and on that consideration, to be worshipped as God, yea, or nay? And where doth the Scripture say, He is Outwardly and Bodily Glorify'd at God's Right hand? Do these terms express the Glory that he had with the Father before the World began, in which He is now Glorified? In Excuse for all this Vehement Denial of Christ's BODILY Existence at the Right Hand of God. T. E. says, p. 40. That sometimes Questions are only for Information, or to amuse an Adversary, not to shew ones own Opinion. Yes, sometimes they are so. And it is very Plain when they are so. And sometimes they are the most Positive way of asserting; as implying an Astonishment or Wonder of the Contrary, as so manifest an Absurdity, as not to be Defended. And it is as manifest when Questions are in this strain. And T. E. dares not say, that these Questions of G. W. were not in this later sense. And therefore his suggesting this, was against his own Conscience; and to shew that he was Resolv'd to support his Cause, Right or Wrong.*

His second Answer is yet more Notorious, p. 40. He supposes that R. Gordon, G. W's Opponent intended to Deny the Divinity of Christ (which he never Deny'd, but Strongly asserts) and to set up the Body that was born of

the Virgin, for the only, whole, Intire Christ and Saviour. And that G.W. only meant to oppose him in this. 1st, The Words above quoted were a strange sort of opposition, if this had been so. But 2^{dly}, This is as Errant a Slander as ever was Invented; and T. E. and G.W. know it full well. For R. Gordon held no such thing, nor any thing like it; No, nor any Man that ever was Born, that only the Body was Christ! Did that ever enter into the Head of any Creature! So Confounded, so Destitute of all appearance of Truth, are these Quaker Pretences, whereby, instead of forsaking, they seek to cover and tow Fig-leaves before their Nakedness. They have but one Security left, That it is a shame to Confute them. But this Drudgery some must undergo, for the Good of those among them, who are not stung with the Deaf Adder; and to save others out of their Cobweb but Destructive Snares, to those who are bewitch'd into them.

VI. As vile and gross, but more Impudent is that Imputation which T.E. puts upon whole Professions of Christians, in Vindication of G.W's answer to a Baptist, who from Rev. 1. 7. infer'd that Those who Pierced him (Christ) in his Body of Flesh, shall see that Body visibly come again: which G.W. opposes, and says that this is an addition to the Scripture. And T.E. p. 47. brings him off, as before, by supposing that the Baptist meant, as if Christ's Body, at his coming to Judgment, should not be chang'd at all from the condition and appearance it had upon Earth, and that it was only this sort of Appearance which G.W. opposed. *It is well known* (says he, p. 49.) *that many of the Baptists, as well as others of other Professions, do hold the Body of Christ now in Heaven, to be as Really and Materially a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, as it was when upon the Cross.* And p. 47. *Not so much as mentioning any Change in it.* Now if there never was a Christian, who did not believe that Christ's Body was Glorified in Heaven, and much changed from the Condition it was in upon the Cross, how will T.E. answer for this Horrid and Senseless Imputation cast upon so many Christians? How will he clear G.W. from Denying Christ's outward appearance at the Great Day, when he can save him by no other Supposition than this, which is notoriously False, to all that bear the Name of Christians? Ay, and must be so to T.E. and G.W. themselves.

VII. Here T.E. spends a great deal of fruitless pains (as in several other places) in Retorting upon G.K. But leave him to defend himself. He needs no Second in his Contest with them. For, as to the Points of Doctrine Debated, he has brought them (for the most part) to comply with him, at least to Counterfeit an Agreement, which is a Greater Victory, if that were his aim. They Confess that they have no Objection against his Morals, and that they Differ not in Doctrine from him; and yet have Excommunicated him, that is, have Condemned themselves. And as to their Retortions and In-consistencies, charg'd upon him, he has hitherto kept himself superiour to them. And set them an Example, which

which is the only Method to save their *Consciences* and *Reputation*; if they have not too much *Pride* to follow it, that is, he has own'd that there are some *Errors* in his former Books, and has Promis'd to Print a *Retraction* of them, as St. *Augustine*, and other Great Men have done; and to their Greater Praise. But T. E. and the Party he defends, stand still upon their *Infallibility*, after it is Expos'd to the utmost Contempt. They will yield no *Error* in themselves, no not in an *Ida*; not in their saying that *Christ* was born at *Nazareth*: which T. E. in his *Truth Defended*, printed 1695. p. 167. quotes out of W. Penn's *Christian Quaker*, p. 104. But, on the contrary, They Invent such *Salvo's*, and strange *Fetches*, to Reconcile their *Heresies* and *Contradictions* (as T. E. in the Present Case) that sinks them Deeper into the Mire, is a Plain *conviction* of their *guilt*; and makes them a Laughing-stock to all *Mankind*. But like a *Bird* that hides his Head, and thinks no body sees him: so they, while they do not confess against themselves, think themselves safe, and will persuade many of their Implicit Followers, that no body else sees them.

VIII. But enough of this. Let us Return to T. E. p. 53. he Defends G. W.'s Disputation against a *Baptist*, for asserting that there was a *Personal Christ* now in Heaven, at God's *Right Hand*: all which G. W. turns *Inward*, viz. a God's *Right Hand WITHIN US*; and a *Christ WITHIN US*: and to understand these as out of his People, in a *Personal* being, which are no *Scripture* terms (says he) still implies him to be a *Personal* God or *Christ*, like the *Anthropomorphite* or *Muggletonians* conceit of him. So that it seems a *Personal* God or *Christ WITHOUT US*, is as Ridiculous to G. W. as the *Anthropomorphit* or *Muggletonian* conceit, of God's having a *Body*, in *shape* and *circumscription* like to ours. Can we imagine these Men so Ignorant as to know no Difference betwixt *Person* and *Body*; but to think every *Person* to be a *Body*; because, in common speaking, when we say such a *Person*, we mean a *Man*; and this *Man* has a *Body*? This, sure, must be the Size of their *Philosophy*! though it is hard to believe it, that Men who are *Writers*, and trouble the World with *Books*, should remain in such Childish Ignorance, as to think that no *Spirit* is a *Person*; for which only reason, they Deny *Personality* to *God*; and by this fall into the same *Muggletonism* with which they charge the *Baptist*. For, if *God* cannot be a *Person* without having a *Body*; then He must have a *Body*, or have no *Existence*, because every *Intelligent-Being* is a *Person*, that is the Meaning of the word *Person*: Which if the *Quakers* have not hitherto understood, Let them go to School again, and Learn to Read before they Write, and to Humbly themselves Greatly before *God*; and confess their Fault before Men; for Causing so Grievous a *Schism* in the *Church*; and Branding so many *Christians*, all the World, but themselves, as *Limbs* of the *Devil*, and *Deserters* of the *Faith*, upon a *Mistake*, which Proceeds merely from their own *Ignorance*. But though *God* be a *Person* without

a Body; yet *Christ* has now, and ever will have a Body, an *Human Body*, in His Person; even the same Body which he took of the Blessed *Virgin*, in which He Suffer'd, Rose from the Dead, and Ascended into Heaven. And for G. W. to call this the *Anthropomorphit*, or *Muggletonian* Conceit, shews his Utter Ignorance, and Blind Heresie; for both these give a Body to God, i. e. to God the Father, to the very Nature of the Deity. Which has no Relation to those who acknowledge only the Body of *Christ*, but own no Body of the Father. But G. W. puts both in the same Bottom; and makes the one as absurd and contradictory as the other, to shew how sound and orthodox he is in the *Christian* Faith! And T. E. makes no other Defence for G. W. but his Old False Suppose, that this *Baptist* was an *Anthropomorphit*. Nay, p. 53. he finds fault with G. K. for saying that There is no Church of England Man, Presbyterian, or Baptist, that holds that notion, That the Godhead has the shape of a Man. T. E. tells him that he is too slight a Voucher for all of these Communions. Insinuating as if some of them did hold that Notion; against his own Heart; which knows the contrary. All the World knows it, That all these Communions do Detest and Abominate any such Notion. Nor can I tell him, in all *Christendom*, where to find (except himself and Partners) any Associates for the *Muggletonians* in this Point, but only their Brethren the *Bidleite* Socinians, or Unitarians, for Bidle was a Profess'd *Anthropomorphit*, as he has Publish'd in his *Socinian Catechism*. But T. E. takes great pains to prove that G. W. do's acknowledge (in what *Sophistical* sense he understands, and we too now understand them) a Body of *Christ* now in Heaven. Let him free himself then, upon this Hypothesis, from *Muggletonism*, and he will at the same time see all those set free, whom he most falsely accuses with it. But what Body of *Christ* do's he allow now in Heaven? a *Spiritual Body* all do allow. But is it a true *Human Body* in our Nature? No, keep off that—That would discover all—for the Nature of *Christ* (says G. W. as quoted by T. E. p. 58.) is Pure, so that it is not their (i. e. Human) Nature, for their Nature is Filthy, therefore it is not in *Christ*. Here G. W. expressly Denys, and endeavours to Prove that *Christ* has not now our *Human Nature*; because (forsooth) our Nature is Filthy, that is, Corrupted. But did the *Baptist* say that it was Filthy in *Christ*? No. Expressly the Contrary. He said that it was Pure in *Christ*, tho' Corrupted in us. And how now do's T. E. bring off G. W. in this? Why? after the Old Fashion, i. e. he says that G. W. only meant that our Nature was not in *Christ*, that is (says he) as it is Filthy! which the *Baptist*, nor any other ever said. So that he sets up a Man of Straw, and throws him down again; and thinks thus to Deceive all Mankind, and keep their Vile Heresies still in the Dark. But they are Discovered.

IX. T. E. p. 67. sets down J. Faldo's Objection against the *Quakers*, viz. That Christianity was introduced by Preaching the Promised Messias, and Pointing

Fainting at His Human Person; but Quakerism by Preaching a Light within. And then gives *W. Penn's* Answer, that had they Preached a Christ Now coming in the Flesh, they had Denied his true Visible Appearance at Jerusalem. And therefore that since they believe that Appearance, they need not Preach what is not to be again. Why? did *Faldo*, or any other, contend for a New Incarnation of Christ, or His Now coming in the Flesh? This is a strange Perversion! But such are necessary to support the Quakers Doctrine: And then the Inference is as Wild; That there is no Need of Preaching the Incarnation of Christ, because It is not to be again. i.e. We have done with it. It is past and gone, and of no more use to us. But *T. E.* excuses it thus, p. 71. That they should not Preach ONLY the Incarnation and Sufferings of Christ at Jerusalem, i.e. without Preaching likewise the Inward Operations of his Spirit in our Hearts. Why? did *J. Faldo*, or any other oppose this? No surely. Why then did they oppose *J. Faldo's* urging the Necessity of Preaching a Christ without, and not only *The Light within*? For that was all *J. Faldo* meant or said. *T. E.* says again (*ibid.*) that there is no need of Preaching Christ's outward Appearance ON THAT ACCOUNT, that is, for Proving his Spiritual Appearance. He might as well have said, For Proving there was a God, or any Influence from God. This was no Part of the Controversie. Again. *T. E.* says, (*ibid.*) there was no need of Preaching Christ's outward appearance UNTIL His Inward Appearance was Preached. Here are *Salvo's*, which if they Pass, there is no Treason, Heresie, Blasphemy, or Idolatry, but may securely be vended. For Example, if any should say that the King is not King of England, i.e. not only, for he is of Scotland and Ireland too. That Christ is not God, i.e. not only, for He is Man too. That GOD is not Just, i.e. not only, for He is Merciful too. That we need no more Preach Faith or Repentance, i.e. not only, for there are Good Works, &c. to be Preached. That we may worship an Image, i.e. Supposing it to be God, or a Special Presence of God in it, &c. If I should say that *T. E.* was not an Honest Man, or a Fair Dealer; and when taxed for it, should think to come off by saying, that he was not only so; but a Good Husband, and a Dutiful Son besides, would he so Excuse me? But what was the Reason which *W. Penn* gave why the outward appearance of Christ at Jerusalem need not be Preached any more? it was none of these Ingenious Contrivances which *T. E.* has since found out, it was not Only, or Until, or on that Account; but Himself tells the Reason very Plainly, it was, because that outward appearance was Past; and therefore, says he, for that Cause, and because it was not to be again, it need not now to be Preached. And therefore we need not Preach what is not to be again. But there is farther in Mr. Penn's Reasons, quoted by *T. E.* viz. And that the whole Christian World besides (the Quakers) have so long and Lazily Depended on it, without their thirsting after his Inward Holy Appearance in the Conscience. This is a Hard Censure. But *T. E.* says, p. 73. That this do's not Include

Include every single Man (except the Quakers) in the whole Christian World. That is very Gracious! Though W. P. did not the Favour to Except Any. But our Dispute now is not concerning Mens Practices, but their Principles. And if W. P. or T. E. cannot Name one single Man, much less any of those Communions which he Disputes against, that ever thought Christ's outward Appearance would save them, without His Inward Holy Appearance in their Consciences; then against whom have they Disputed? Whom have they Condemned? And if all that can be said in Defence of such Desperate and Blasphemous Positions as have dropt from their Pens, be such a Supposition as this, then must they unavoidably fall under the Load of what is Charg'd upon them. And till they not only Repent, but Confess, they can have no Pardon from God or Men. For Christ's outward Appearance and Sufferings at Jerusalem, tho' Past; and not to be again, must always be Preached, as being the Foundation of the Whole Christian Faith. Which the Quakers have Reduc'd back again to the same Level with the Heathen, as will appear more fully in the next Quotation.

X. Which is p. 74. where T. E. justifies these Words of W. P. The Distinction betwixt Moral and Christian, the making Holy Life Legal, and Faith in Christ's outward Manifestation, Christianity; has been a Deadly Poyson these later Ages have been Infected with. Which T. E. after the Old Fashion, solves, by supposing, p. 75. that J. Faldo, and others his Opponents did hold, That a Bare Historical Belief of Christ's outward appearance in the Flesh, is of more value and advantage to them, than a Vertuous, Pious, Godly Life. What then? Is there therefore no Distinction betwixt Moral and Christian? But, in the next place, neither J. Faldo, or any of W. Penn's Opponents, ever Believ'd or Imagin'd any such thing, as that a Bare, Historical Faith (which the Devils have, and Tremble) would save any Man, or was Preferable to a Pious, Godly Life. But you would make Monsters of other Men, to Hide your own Deformity. For, in the next Quotation, p. 75. W. P. not only Drops an Expression, but argues, at length, for the Heathen, that is, as he there describes them, those who never had the External Law nor Forgery, and would prove them to be Christians thus, Let us but soberly consider (says he) what Christ is, and we shall the better know, whether Moral Men are to be Reckon'd Christians. What is Christ but Meekness, Justice, Mercy? &c. Can we then Deny a Meek Man to be a Christian? This is according to Mr. Penn's Theology (which will be consider'd by and by) of making the Promis'd Seed of the Woman, Gen. 3. 15. not to be Christ's Human Nature, which he took of the Blessed Virgin, but only an Inward Principle, i. e. the Light within; which the Heathen have; and so have Christ; and are therefore Good Christians, according to the Quaker Doctrine.

In Answer to this, T. E. has given the first Proof of Ingenuity, that I have found in this Book of his. For he go's not about (as in other cases) to excuse, or mollify this; But down-right Justifies it, that moral Heathens are

are Good Christians: Nay, he seems to Prefer the *Heathen*, whom he calls *A Child of God*, in Contradistinction from a *Christian*. He makes nothing of *Christianity* but only an outward Character, or Discriminating Difference, viz. an *Historical Faith* of *Christ's outward Appearance in the Flesh at Jerusalem*. Which indeed, if that be all, is but a very small matter, a little *History*; But he makes the *Heathen* to have The Kind and Nature of a *Christian*, which he Prefers to that outward Character, or Discriminating Difference which do's distinguish him from the *Historical Christian*. G. Keith had allow'd that *Morality* was a part of *Christianity*, and did belong to the Genus of a *Christian*. But there are two things (said he) in the true Distinction of a Man, the Genus and the Differentia; they have the Genus, but not the Differentia. But this would not satisfy T. E. he objects against this, and shews his Parts in *Philosophy*, as well as *Trinity*. And I pray (says he) which is of most Moment in this case, the Genus or the Differentia? To have the Kind and Nature of a *Christian*, or to have only some outward Character, or Discriminating Difference, to distinguish a *Christian* from a *Child of God*, as Namely an *Historical Faith* of *Christ's outward appearance in the Flesh at Jerusalem*? But with submission, I must correct T. E's *Philosophy*; for it is the Differentia, not the Genus which Determines the Kind or Nature. *Animal* is the Genus of *Man*, but it is *Rationale* which makes him of a Different Kind or Species from other *Animals*. And this sets the Differentia as much above the Genus, as *Man* is above a *Beast*. But by T. E's Logick, *Bucephalus* is little Inferior to him, only in some outward Character: For, which I pray, is of most Moment in this case, the Genus or the Differentia? *Bucephalus* has the Genus, and T. E. has the Differentia, and, as himself makes it, but a small one. Therefore, tho' a *Moral Heathen* have the Genus of a *Christian*, yet he can no more be a *Christian* without the Differentia, than a *Horse* can be T. E. And this Differentia is not only an *Historical Faith* in *Christ's Appearance in the Flesh*, as T. E. makes it? But a *Living Faith* in his *Blood* outwardly shed, as the Full *Atonement* and *Satisfaction* made to the *Justice* of *God* for our *Sins*. And as far as any one is from this *Faith*, so far he is from *Christianity*. Therefore the *Quakers*, by Disputing against and Disowning of this *Faith*, instead of bringing the *Heathen* within the *Pale* of *Christianity*, have thrust themselves out among the *Heathen*. From whom, their merely *Historical Faith* in the *Death* and *Sufferings* of *Christ*, as T. E. rightly argues, do's Difference them very little. And let the *Quakers* here Consider to what a Condition they have brought themselves; That they cannot Pretend to be *Christians*, but upon such Principles as must bring in all the *Heathen* with them. That is to say Truly and Really, they are no more *Christians* than the *Heathen*; and that they are Preaching up *Heathenism*, instead of *Christianity* amongst us; by making them Both to be the same thing; or to Differ only in some small Circumstances, which are not necessary to the *Christian Faith*. For says

W. P. as *T. E.* quotes him, p. 77. As he that Believes in Christ, Believes in God: so he that Believes in God, Believes in Christ. Which is a fine Round saying, but the latter Part is notoriously otherwise: for the *Heathen* Believe a God, who never heard of Christ. But Christ is the Light within! and the Light within is Christ! And all the *Heathen* have the Light within! therefore they all have Christ! This is the true *Quaker* Doctrine, and all the Notion they have of Christianity. They have let us see it very plainly. We thank them.

XI. This is the Meaning of what *T. E.* would Excuse, p. 78. viz. That *W. Penn* spending about three Pages in Folio, to give the Description of A True Christian *Quaker*, has forgot to speak one Word of the *Man Christ*, as the Object either of the Christian *Quaker's* Faith, Love, or Homage. *T. E.'s* Excuse is, That *W. P.* was then Describing who he or they are that obey the Light. And was it not strange that the *Quaker* Light should quite overlook the outward Christ? It could not be, had they Believ'd in Him, as Impossible as that a Man could Describe the true Faith in God, and yet never name God at all. It is the same thing to Pretend to Describe the Christian Faith, without Naming of Christ. One would wonder how any could avoid it, even in the first Line. This cannot be *Forgetfulness*: or it was a very Artificial one.

XII. So was not that which is next quoted of his, p. 79. &c. where he makes the Inward Work of Regeneration performed by the Light within a Greater Mystery than the Incarnation of Christ. If the Manifestation (said he) of the Son of God in the Flesh be a Mystery; how much more is the Work of Regeneration a Mystery, that is wholly Inward and Spiritual in its operation? This shews how much they Prefer their Light within to the outward Christ. But *T. E.* says, p. 82. That the Comparison here did not lie between the Incarnation of Christ, and the work of Regeneration: But between the Difficulty of Believing the one, and Experiencing the other. But I must tell *T. E.* That he is Mistaken, and that his Excuse is point-blank contrary to *Mr. Penn's* own Words, which lay the Comparison Expressly betwixt the Incarnation of Christ, and the Work of Regeneration. And this Put-off, is to suppose all his Readers to be Children, or not to Understand English or Common sense. This is not Explaining, but quite Altering of Words: Adding and Subtracting at Pleasure. Though if *T. E.'s* Sense were admitted, it would not mend the Matter. Because the Saving Faith of Christ's Incarnation, &c. is our Regeneration. But I will not stay upon that. My Business now being only to Consider his Defence of others, not to follow as many New Notions as he, in his Distress, is Forced to start. He says that *W. P.* has this same Notion in other Places. So let him. But we are now Considering of this Place: And if it be Unsound, let him confess and Retract. And it is a favour to him, not to Pursue those other Places which *T. E.* quotes out of his other Works. They make the Matter still worse and worse, as p. 82. where he brings in *W. P.* Objecting against *J. Faldo*,

See That they made the *History* (i. e. *Christ's Incarnation*) the *Greatest Mystery*, i. e. Greater than the Operation of their *Light within*. And so do all true *Christians*. But *W. P.* calls the *Incarnation of Christ* the *History*, and the *Light within* the *Mystery*, as bring *Greater*; 'Tis *Strange* (says he, in the same place which *T. E.* quotes, i. e. of his *Rejoinder*, p. 336.) that should be reputed most *mysterious* (speaking of *Christ's Incarnation*) which was the *Introduction to the Mystery* (i. e. of the *Light within*) and those *Transactions*, (i. e. of *Christ's outward Sufferings*) counted most *Difficult*, that were as so many *Facile Representations* of what was to be accomplished in *Man*. In short, it is to lessen, if not totally exclude the *True Mystery of Godliness*, which is *Christ Manifested in his Children*. Here he makes the *Light within* the *True Mystery*; which implies the *Incarnation* and *outward Sufferings* of *Christ* were not the *True Mystery*. He calls them but *Facile Representations* of the *True Mystery*, i. e. The *Light within*, and but the *Introduction* to it: and wonders that any should think the *outward Sufferings* of *Christ*, which he calls *those Transactions*, to be more difficult than the *Inward Transactions* of the *Light* in their *Hearts*. And now I with *T. E.* Joy of this Book of *W. P.*'s, which he has call'd in to his Aid. But I hasten from this, and much more of this sort, which I could Produce.

I likewise pass over several *Monstrous Absurdities* in *T. E.*'s own *Notions*, which he Interposes, as not being the subject I am now Pursuing. He says, p. 83. That *Christ's Incarnation* was not properly call'd a *Mystery*, from the *Perfection of Holiness* that was in Him. Was it no part of the *Mystery*, or not properly so, that the *Fulness of the Godhead*, the *Highest Perfection of Holiness* Dwelt Bodily in a *Man*? Is this no *Mystery*? But I proceed. He brings a *New* and his *Old Defence* for *W. P.* he says, p. 84. It is Plain that the *Scope and Crift* of these *Words* of *W. P.* was to persuade *People* not to rest Barely in an *Historical Belief* of *Christ's Incarnation*—But to come to a *Living Faith*, &c. But, as I have often Reply'd before, there being no such *People* whose *Principle* it is to Rest Barely upon an *Historical Faith*, none such who oppos'd *W. P.* therefore it is plain, that this is a meer sham pretence, only to cover and hide the *Broadest of Heresies* or *Blasphemies* that can be spoken. But *T. E.* in the same page, to Lessen the *Faith* in the *outward Jesus*, endeavours to Render it *Mighty Easy*, in comparison of their *Inward Light*. For little of *Difficulty* (says he) there is in Barely and *Historically* believing this (i. e. That God sent *Christ* to Dye for Sinners, and to reconcile God to Men by His Death) the *Common Faith* of all that Part of the *World* called *Christian* shews, wherein all *Professions*, and the most *Profligate* and *Froghane* in any *Profession*, doth so Believe it. I with *T. E.* were not out in his *Reckoning*, i. e. That all these he Names did Really and Truly Believe this, even *Historically*. But that it self (though that alone will not do) is not so *Easy* a Matter as he would make it. He sees, at least we do, how *Hard* a Task it is with the *Quakers*, who will

not Believe that the *outward Death of Christ* was ordain'd as the *Satisfaction* for their *Sin*. The *Socinians* do likewise openly oppose this, and all the *Deists*. Into which Societies, the Greatest Numbers of our open *Debauchees* do glory to Inlist themselves. These call themselves the *Peaux Esprits*, the Men of *Sense*, and *Large Thoughts*: and among the *Profligate* and *Prophane* of the Meaner Rank; Few, if any of them do Really Believe it, even *Historically*; or *forget it*, and never think of it: otherwise it would have a Greater Influence upon them. For the *Historical Faith* must be Inseparable from the *Saving Faith*: And indeed the *Saving Faith*, is the *Historical*, thoroughly Digested, and Apply'd. And it is often seen that they who do neglect so to actly it, do, in time, quite lose it: And it is Generally *Lost* amongst the *Vicious* and *Prophane* of all sorts, so that Few of them are to be found, who have even the *Historical Faith*. They Repent not, that they may Believe, *Math. 21. 32*. A *Virtuous Life* is a necessary Qualification even for a True Belief of *Christ*; Which is a Gift of *God*, *Ephes. 11. 8*. And *John the Baptist* was sent to Preach Repentance, as a Necessary Preparation to Receive the Faith of *Christ*. So that this is not so Easie a Matter as T. E. thinks; nor Common to the *Vicious* and *Hypocrites*; who lessen it, and slight it, as the *Quakers* have Endeavour'd; as T. E. endeavours, p. 86. where speaking of his Beloved *Heathen-Christians*, he presses it upon G. Keith, That he must grant the *Object* of their Faith to be, not the outward Appearance of *Christ* in the *Flesh*; but His Inward Appearance and Manifestation, in and by His Divine Light, Life, Word and Power in their Hearts. This is Plain Language! And this, he says, must be Granted, if we allow that any of them can be saved. Which to be sure T. E. do's, who gives them the *Genue*, which he thinks the chief Part of Christianity.

How God will Deal with the Good Moral *Heathen*, who never Heard of *Christ*, I will not determin, nor enter into the *Secrets of Providence*: But that they have the *Christian Faith*, by Believing their *Light within*; or that their is any *Object* of the *Christian Faith* without the outward *Jesus*, who suffered at *Jerusalem*, is a *Quaker Dream*, and opposit to the whole Tenure of the *Gospel*. And now that I have shewn the difficulty of attaining to the outward and *Historical Faith* of *Christ*; let me Compare with it the Difficulty which the *Quakers* Pretend there is in attaining to whar they call their *Inward Faith* in their *Light within*: which, as they have Manag'd it, is indeed as Difficult, as for a Man to run out of his Wits: But to Minds Prepar'd for such *Enthusiastical Delusions*, it is as Easie as to think Highly of ones self; and construe all the strong *Imaginations* of their own Brain, for *Immediate Revelations*: And of this Method the Easiness may appear, from the Qualifications of the Persons most subject to it. Ignorance is the true Mother of their Devotion. But such a Profound Degree of this Intoxication as Possesses the Generality of *Quakers*, I will grant

grant is not Easie to be Met with; or to be found among any other Discrimination of Men, that are known in our Parts of the World, if any where at all, either of the Present or Past Ages: yet it is an *Easie* and a *Common* thing for Men to follow their own *Imaginations*; and *Supineness*, *Ignorance*, and *Conceitedness* do naturally Produce it; so that (to apply T. E's own Distinction) To Believe even *Historically* *Christ's* Coming in the *Flesh*; and the True *Ends* and *Design* of it, is *Harder* than to *Experience* my Minds running without *Care* or *Pains*, after my own *Fansie*, which Men do to avoid *Labour*, and the difficulty of *Examining* and *Comparing*: For the Workings of *Reason* are full of *Labour*; not so of the *Imagination*; which is strongest in *Mad-Men*, and those most Destitute of *Reason*. And the *Sobriety* of *Religion* is with much more *Pains* acquir'd, than the *Levity* of *Imagination*, which has no *Stint* or *Rule*, but Runs away with those who have not the *Curb* of *Reason* to govern it, as a wild Horse, when the *Bridle* is broke. And therefore, the *Be'ring* of the *One*, which T. E. speaks of, i. e. the *Historical Faith* of *Christ's* *Incarnation*, &c. and the True *Ends* of it, is more *Difficult* than the *Experiencing* of the other, i. e. the workings of what they call their *Light within*; as much more *Difficult*, as *Knowledge* is more *Difficult* than *Ignorance*, and *Reason* than *Imagination*. And they are *Novices*, know least of *Religion*, who are soonest lifted up with *Pride*: and these fall into the *Condemnation* of 1 Tim. iii. 6. the *Devil*; who *Transforms* himself into an *Angel of Light*; as often as he can *Perswade* any to put *Darkness* for *Light*, and *Light* for *Darkness*.

XIII. *W. Penn* contends earnestly, that the *Seed* of the *Woman* Promised *Gen. iii. 15.* was not that *Jesus* who was Born of the Blessed *Virgin*, or any other *Person*, but only a *Principle*, or *Seed* in every Man's *Heart*. The *Seed* (says he, as quoted by T. E. p. 91.) cannot be that *Body*, (i. e. of *Christ*) and consequently the *Seed* of the Promise is an *Holy* and *Spiritual Principle* of *Light*, &c. received into the *Heart*. And this *Light within* he makes to be *Christ*. Now see how T. E. endeavours to *Rescue* him. He says, p. 90. concerning *Christ's* *Body*, That that *Body*, simply Consider'd as a *Natural Body*; which (says he) was the *Notion* the *Adversaries* had of it, was not properly the *Christ*. But there were no such *Adversaries*, no, not one that oppos'd *W. P.* who said, that the *Body* of *Christ*, simply considered as a *Natural Body*, was properly the *Christ*. No Man in this *World* ever said so. Therefore *W. P.* is no ways *Justified*, but rather *Exposed* by this: and the *Quaker* Principles laid more open.

XIV. One of *W. P.*'s Arguments by which he Endeavours to Prove that the outward *Christ* was not the *Promis'd Seed*, is, because (as he says) One outward thing cannot be the *Proper Figure* or *Representation* of another: And the *Passover* being a *Type* of *Christ*, he thence infers, That the outward *Lamb*, shews forth the *Inward Lamb*, i. e. the *Light within*. This is set down,

Down, p. 90. of T. E. among other such like Arguments of W. P. and T. E. answers, p. 91. W. P. did not say the Paschal Lamb was no Figure of Christ without. Did he not? What then becomes of W. P.'s Argument, That one outward thing cannot be the Figure of another? CANNOT, it is impossible, i. e. The Paschal Lamb, not only was not, but Could not be the Figure of Christ. But as T. E. has put it, Christ may still be the Promised Seed, even the outward Christ, which W. P. said Could not be.

T. E. Pleads again, p. 96. and catches hold of the Word Proper, in W. P. and seeks to Draw him out of the Mire by that Twig, viz. That one outward thing cannot Properly be the Figure or Representation of another. And so he makes the Paschal Lamb to be Properly a Figure of the Inward Lamb, i. e. The Light within. But Improperly a Figure of the outward Christ. This is hard Fishing! and renders their Heresie yet more Broad. Psal. The Paschal Lamb was many ways a Type of the outward Christ, and of His Sufferings outwardly in the Flesh. It Sacrific'd, so He: N^o Bone of it Broken, so none of His: The Door-Posts sprinkled with its Blood, so our Consciences by His Blood: It Sav'd from the destroying Angel, so His Blood from Sin and Death: It without Blemish, He without Sin: It with Bitter Herbs, He with Bitter Dolours upon the Cross — And several other Parallels which are betwixt them. Which all were proper and fit Types of Him. Otherwise T. E. arraigns the Wisdom of God for making Improper Types. But these Types can no ways, but by a Mad Imagination, be apply'd to the Light within, which, in the Quaker Sense, sheds its Blood WITHIN, and its Bones are not Broken WITHIN, &c. And of this the Paschal Lamb was a Proper Type! But an Improper Type of Christ without! It could not be Apply'd to Him, but by Long and Strange Fetches! But of the Sufferings, Blood, and Bones of the Light within, you see how Naturally, and Most Properly, They are all Typify'd! And doth it not so? says T. E. p. 92. i. e. The outward Lamb shew forth the Inward Lamb. Just as you have seen! and as T. E. thumbles upon it, p. 93. where he forgets himself (for Great Wins have Short Memories) and owls quite contrary to what I have quoted. That it was the outward Body, or Manhood only of Christ our Spiritual Passover, that, in a strict and proper Sense, was ~~not~~ to be slain. Now we are come quite about again, Now the outward Lamb shews forth the Inward Lamb, neither Strictly nor Properly; But the outward Body of Christ; and that Only. And now T. E. has left W. P. where he found him, To say what he can for one outward thing, not being the Type of another. That the outward Lamb shews forth the Inward Lamb, &c.

XV. T. E. shews us how hard it is to find out a Quaker by Words; what Double Meanings and Secret Reserves they have in every thing that they say: and that they can say (when Pinch'd) any Words that can be Required of them; without Danger of being Discover'd. When they

acknowledge Christ to be *Man*, do they mean the same thing as we do? No, far from it. They have a *Spiritual Manhood*, that means quite another thing. And in this Sense, T. E. acknowledges, p. 97. That Christ was truly a *MAN*, before he appear'd in the outward Body, which was Nail'd to the Cross; and that not only In his People, but out of, or without them also. How long before? Even From the Beginning. And if he was Truly Man, then (says he) so be sure He is not less truly Man now. Yes! to be sure! and they think Him to be as Little Man NOW, as He was Then. But they are Desir'd (if they would be so Good) to let us know, How Christ became the Son of Man, how He took upon Him our Flesh, how He was the Seed of the Woman Promised, Gen. 3. before He was Made of a Woman, and even before any Woman in the World was Made. This is New Divinity! These Men Dance in the Clouds. They have not a Mind to be understood; which is a Demonstration that they Mean not as we do; and that their Meaning is not Good.

No! to be sure!

SECT. 2.

of Justification and Sanctification by the Blood of Christ, outwardly shed.

I. WE come now to the Second Head of G. Keith's Charge, which T. E. begins to Answer, p. 103. which is, That the Quakers do Deny Justification and Sanctification by the Blood of Christ outwardly shed. And the first Proof is W. Penn, who Totally Excludes the Satisfaction of Christ. His Argument is from that Petition in the Lord's Prayer, *Forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors*. From whence W. P. infers, That, if it is our Duty to forgive without a satisfaction received; and that God is to forgive us, as we forgive them, then is a Satisfaction Totally Excluded. But though the Debtor makes no satisfaction, yet God has promised to do it, in Full Measure, Pressed down, shaken together, and Running over, to those who Forgive any thing for His sake. So that here is Satisfaction not Totally Excluded; But Filled up, even to the Brim. But how does T. E. Answer this? He says, p. 104, 105. That W. P. meant only to Exclude a *PLENARY*, or *FULL*, or *RIGID* (which is the same) Satisfaction. Ist. Every true Satisfaction must be *PLENARY*, else it is no Satisfaction. Paying part of a Debt, is not a Satisfying of the Debt. But 2dly. W. P. neither made any such Distinction, nor could Intend it: For his Argument runs against All Satisfaction. He did not mean that we were Commanded to Forgive our Debtors only in part; else God was to Forgive us but in part, since, as he says, *God is to forgive us, as we forgive them*. And thence concludes, That A Satisfaction, i. e. Any Satisfaction is not only Excluded, but, to shew his Vehemence, *TOTALLY* Excluded. T. E. was no Friend to W. P. in mentioning

tioning his *Sandy Foundation*, upon this occasion, which is wholly *Socinian*, Disputing *Expressly* against the Holy *Trinity*, and the *Satisfaction* of *Christ* Particularly: and I Charitably believe, that he wishes it had never been wrote: and that it may be now Forgotten. Therefore I Forbear to Rip it up.

II. The next Quotation is out of *George Whitehead*, which *T. E.* comes to p. 109. and Repeating the Charge, That *G. W.* blames *W. Burnet*, his Opponent, for saying, *The Blood shed upon the Cross, sprinkles the Conscience, Sanctifies, Justifies, Redeems us*, says, That *G. W.* only Blames him for saying thus, as an Absurdity following upon what *W. Burnet* had said, That *that Blood was not now in Being*. Why? Do's *G. W.* believe that *that Blood* is any otherwise in Being, than as *W. Burnet* did believe? He Dare not say so. And if not, then there was no Contest betwixt *Burnet* and him, upon that Head. So that this is Plainly giving us the Go-by: and all the Consequences which *G. W.* draws, or pretends to draw from that saying of *Burnet's* are fully Chargeable upon Himself.

But 2^{dy}, I desire the Reader here to take Notice of the Grosslest piece of Deceit, that, perhaps, ever he met with: For that saying of *Burnet's* (p. 40. of his Book) is only his Repetition of it, as being the *Quakers* own Objection against the Efficacy of that *Blood* which was shed upon the *Cross*, to us now, viz. That it was not now in Being, and therefore that we could not now be Justified by that which was not in Being. To which *W. Burnet* Answers, That though that *Blood* shed be not in Being (that is Supposing, but not Granting it) yet the Efficacy of that *Blood* is still in Being, and it still speaks in *Goa's* Ears, and crys aloud for Mercy. If *Abel's* *Blood* did cry against the Murderer (for Vengeance) How much more louder doth the *Blood* of the *Lamb* slain, cry for Mercy? &c. Here *Burnet* only gives way to this Supposition of the *Quakers*, viz. That *that Blood* was not in Being, by way of Concession, not as his own Opinion; to shew that no Consequence could be drawn from it, to favour the *Quaker* Heresy of Denying Justification by that *Blood*. And yet *T. E.* (concealing of this) would put it upon Us, That *G. W.* in Answer to this Place of *Burnet*, did oppose him only for that Supposition; and that (agreeing Perfectly with him in Justification by that *Blood*) he only shew'd the Ill Consequences of that Supposition, which was his own; and which he will not, no, nor *T. E.* or any other of their *Quakers*, Dare Deny at this Day; viz. That *that Blood* shed upon the *Cross*, is not now in Being. This is Turning the Tables upon *W. Burnet*, in such an Impudent Manner, that, if I had not seen his Book, I could not have believed it. But 3^{dy}, If that Supposition had been *W. Burnet's*, and not the *Quakers* own, it would not Rescue *G. W.* because he plainly makes the Conclusion his own, by Denying Justification by that *Blood*: However, justly it is drawn from that supposed Supposition. 4^{thly}, The Agonies and Passion of *Christ* upon the *Cross*, are not now

now in being: And this Argument of *G. W.*'s will Dissolve all the Merits of His Death, to our Justification thereby, as well as by His Blood; for indeed they are the same. But y^{thly}, All these little Cavillings about the Blood of Christ, which was shed either before or after His Death, are only to Amuse: For they Deny any Justification by the outward Christ, upon any account. In *A Serious Apology*, written by George Whitehead, and William Penn, printed 1671. p. 148. Repeating a Charge against them in these words. *That we deny Justification by the Righteousness which Christ hath fulfilled in His own Person for us (wholly without us) and therefore Deny the Lord who Bought us.* To which *W. Penn* answers in these words. *And indeed this we Deny, and Bodily affirm it, in the Name of the Lord, To be the Doctrine of Devils, and an Arm of the Sea of Corruption, which does now Deluge the Whole World.* If they think to come off by that saying, wholly without us. I answer, that the Meritorious and only Procuring cause of our Justification is wholly without us, i. e. By the Righteousness which Christ hath fulfilled in His own Person for us; and the Satisfaction which He hath made by His Death and Passion for our Sins. But the Application of this to Particular Persons must be Inward, by the Operation of His blessed Spirit in our Hearts. And this hinders not, but rather supposes that the Meritorious Cause is wholly without us, i. e. All the Merit is to be Attributed to what Christ hath done and suffer'd for us: for we can Merit nothing from God, of our selves. And not only to Deny this, but to call it a Doctrine of Devils, &c. And that In the Name of the Lord! As it shews these Men to be utter Strangers to the true Principles of the Christian Religion; so do's it Deserve an Animadversion which I will spare in this place.

III. *T. E.* p. 111. puts the Baptist's Objection against *G. W.* in these words, *Now the Quakers would be so far from directing Men to go to the Material Temple at Jerusalem, that they make it but a vain thing to look to Jerusalem, to the Anti-Type of that Temple, viz. to Jesus Christ, as he was there Crucified, or to that Blood that was there shed for Justification.* Now says *T. E.* see the Answer which *G. W.* gives, thus, *The Quakers see no need of Directing men to the Type for the Anti-Type, nor yet to Jerusalem, either to Jesus Christ, or His Blood.* — And where do the Scriptures say, the Blood was There shed for Justification? *T. E.* says in Excuse, *That there is a Typographical Error in this Passage.* But do's not Infallibility reach to Writing or Printing, as well as Speaking? It seems the Quaker Infallibility do's not go throughout. But what is this Error? Why instead of *The Quakers see no need of Directing Men to Jerusalem, either To Jesus Christ or His Blood*, it should have been *Either* (says *T. E.*) *For Jesus Christ, &c.* i. e. That Men need not go to Jerusalem, For to look For the outward Material Blood which was shed There 1600 Years ago. Why? was that the Baptist's Meaning? *T. E.* dare not say that. The most Superstitious that ever went thither in Pilgrimage, never thought any thing so absurd as that. y^{thly}, What is the

Difference betwixt *FOR* and *TO* in this Place? To send Men to *Jerusalem*, *TO* look for *Jesus Christ* or *His Blood*, or *FOR* to look for them? sdly, Was this *Typographical Error* ever taken Notice of before? No, not a word of it, though it was Printed in the Year 1663. Were there any *Errata* of the *Press* Printed? Yes, a good many, at the End of the Book. Was not this among them? No. Then surely, it was either thought not to be an *Erratum*: or not so Material as *Transmutation* for *Transmutation*, and several other *Literal Erratas*, which are there carefully Printed. And Trumping it up Now, shews the weak Efforts of a *Dying Cause*; like a *Drowning Man* catching at a *Straw*; which yet do's not save him: For, as before said, this *Typographical Error* (supposing it to be one) do's no service at all to his Cause, but leaves him just where it found him: But what says he to that Expression above quoted, *Where do the Scriptures say, the Blood was there shed for Justification*? This is a Crabbed Place. And though *T. E.* Repeats it again, p. 112. Yet he says not one Word in excuse for it. But *G. W.* lets us see his Opinion fully in the same Book here quoted by *T. E.* viz. *The Light and Life of Christ within*, Printed 1668. p. 51. where he makes a Dialogue betwixt the *Baptist* he Disputes against, and himself. Thus. *I ask* (says *G. W.*) *who is He that satisfies and appeaseth God, Dischargeth the Guilty, and Pays the Debt?* Bapt. *It is the Man Christ Jesus.* *G. W.* *Whence came He?* Bapt. *God gave Him.* *G. W.* *And what is this Man Christ Jesus, who can Satisfy, Pacify an Infinite God?* Bapt. *He is God-Man, born of a Virgin.* *G. W.* *How would this Divide God, and set Him at Distance from Himself?* *Is it good Doctrine to say, That God Pacified God when He saw Himself angry?* For says the *Baptist*, *It was God-Man that did it. Which is all one as to say, God Corrected Himself—and then He was Mediator to Himself, &c.* Thus *G. W.* Blasphemously (with the *Socinians*, and in their very words) Ridicules the Satisfaction of *Christ*, and our Justification by it: and shews his utter Ignorance of the true *Christian Doctrine*. Which I stay not now to Dispute: My Business being only to Detect these Men, That they have Grossly Mistaken it.

But before I proceed, I find my self oblig'd to ask *T. E.*'s Pardon. For that I said just now, while I was considering his page 111. That he Durst not say, That the *Baptist*'s meaning (against whom he Disputes) was to send Men now to *Jerusalem*, to look for the *Blood of Christ* which was shed There 1600 Years ago, as if it were now to be found there. And indeed I thought so, That neither *T. E.* or any Men whatever Durst have ventur'd upon a Supposition so Monstrously Absurd: But, to my great surprize, I find, reading, p. 115. That he Positively, and without any Hesitation asserts it. That the *Baptist* did Direct People now to go Thither (*Jerusalem*) for it (the *Blood of Christ* there shed) or Look thither for it, as if it were now to be found there. These are his Words. I will not take up the Reader's time to vindicate this *Baptist*, (*W. Burnet*) whom *T. E.* thus accuses; but Refer

to his Book, Intituled, *The Capital Errors of the People called Quakers*, Printed 1668. In Answer to which G. W. wrote *The Light and Life*, &c. above quoted. And it will there appear, not only that W. Burnet had no such gross conceit: but that he Plainly and Fully Expresses himself to the Contrary, viz. That it was the *Merit of Christ's Blood*, and *Faith in the Redemption* thereby wrought, that he contended for: and not that the Material *Blood* which was shed at *Jerusalem*, was *Now* there to be found. But the *Quakers* oppose the *Christian Doctrine*: and (when pinched) think to Blind the Eyes of the World, by Pretending that they only spoke against such Opinions, as never were held; and which their Opposers Detest as much as they can do. But if they Differ not from us now in *Doctrine*, as they, of Late, would have us believe: Why then do they *separate* from us? Why have they Branded all other Communions, but themselves, as in the *Apostacy*, as *Conjurers*, *Devils*, &c. Have they never understood our *Doctrine*, till *Now*? Then *Now*, tho' Late, let them Return.

IV. The next Quotation objected by G. Keith, is out of a Letter of one *Solomon Eccles* (A Great Preacher and Prophet of the *Quakers*) where he said, *That the Blood of Christ is no more than the Blood of another Saint*. Which T. E. excuses thus, p. 117. *But that Blood which he said was no more than the Blood of another Saint, was the Blood that was forced out of Him (Christ) by the Souldier after He was Dead*. This is a Plain Confession instead of a Defence. But hear the Reason he gives for it. He makes a Difference betwixt the Blood which *Christ* shed, before His *Breath* went out, which he calls a *Voluntary offering of Christ Himself*; because He was then *Alive*: and betwixt the *Blood* shed after He was *Dead*; which he calls *The Forcible Act of a Souldier*, i. e. not *Voluntary in Christ*; and so of no more *Vertue* than the *Blood of another Saint*. This is Horrible! Did not *Christ* *Voluntarily* Deliver up His *Body* to the *Death*, and His *Blood* to be *Spilt*? yet these Men would render His *Death*, and the *Blood* *Spilt* after it, as a *Force* upon Him: and so take away all the *Vertue* and *Efficacy* of it; and make no more of it, than of the *Blood of another Saint*! But *Saint John*, ch. xix. 34. 35. lays much Greater stress upon it; And tells this, with more Particular Observation, than of the shedding of any other Part of His *Blood*. Then it was that the *Blood* and *Water* Issued forth out of His *Side*, the Two *Sacraments* of *Baptism*, and His *Supper*; and Two of the Three Great *Witnesses* upon Earth. And this *Piercing* 1 John v. 8. of *Christ's Body*, after He was *Dead*, is Recorded, ver. 37. 23. the Fulfilling of that Famous Prophecie, *Zech. xii. 10*. And, as the Great Ground and Confirmation of our *Faith*. And he that saw it, bare Record, and his Record is True: And he knoweth that he saith True, that ye might Believe. Know ye not (said St. Paul) That so many of us as were Baptized into *Jesus Christ*, were Baptized into His *Death*. There- Rom. vi. 3. fore we are Buried with Him, by Baptism, into *Death*. But why Buried with Him (upon the *Quaker Doctrine*) more than with any other

int? For His Burial was not Voluntary: He was then Dead! And it is
 no Wonder that they have thrown off the Baptism of His Death, who
 have Renounced the Benefit of His Death it self, of His Blood after that
 shed, and of His Burial. He was no more to them after He was Dead,
 than any other of their Friends or Saints. Can Christian Ears bear this!
 Well then, to Mollifie this, since Christians do take it so ill, T. E. will
 let it pass as an Unjustifiable Expression. And says that in his Truth De-
 fended, p. 112. He has call'd it so: But when was this Book Printed? last
 Year, 1695. In Answer to this then objected against them by G. Keith;
 and to stop All Christians from Running upon them as Blasphemers. But
 2dly, How do's T. E. call this an Unjustifiable Expression, in that Book?
 Do's he do it Plainly and Honestly; and with any Zeal against so Foul a
 Contempt cast upon the Death of our Lord? No, nothing like it. Nay,
 he do's not so much as own it to be Unjustifiable; but puts an If to it.
 And therefore (says he) If Sol. Eccles did let fall any Unjustifiable Expression
 concerning that Blood that was forced out of Christ's Body by the Souldier's
 Spear, after He was Dead, as that it was no more than the Blood of another
 Saint—How Mr. Ellwood! Do you make an If of it? It is Easie then
 to see what you think of it. You meant by an Unjustifiable an Inconve-
 nient Expression, and so Unjustifiable, that should lay you open to the Odi-
 um of All that own the Name of Christ. You say that G. W. has like-
 wise disclaimed those Words of Sol. Eccles. How is that? After such a
 Manner as you have done, by saying, as you Repeat his words, p. 117.
 I do not make S. Eccles's Expressions therein an Article of our Faith. This
 was a Terrible Rebuke! They may be True and Laudable too for all
 this: For Many things are so, which are no Articles of Faith. But Hark
 you Good T. E. How came you to Falsifie your Friend G. W.'s Words, by
 Conceding a Material Part of them; and Nibbling them out of the middle
 of one short Sentence? For his words are these (p. 59. of his Light and
 Life, &c.) And yet I do not make Sol. Eccles his Expressions therein (especially
 as construed by our Adversaries) to be an Article of our Faith. Here is a se-
 cret Reserve. As construed by our Adversaries. Then it seems the words
 are justifiable enough in themselves; but how do their Adversaries con-
 strue them? we have seen what Constructions they can put upon their
 Adversaries Meanings! And here is a Hole for them to creep out at;
 when ever they shall be Taxed by any of their own Party, with this
 their Modest Reproof of Sol. Eccles. G. Keith taxes them, very justly,
 for not shewing their Dislike of this Blasphemy of S. Eccles, severely and
 sharply as T. E. mentions it, p. 124. and answers, That if they were as
 Hot-headed as G. K. perhaps they might: But that Blasphemy is, a High
 Charge, and they that understand it aright, are not so forward as G. K. (it
 seems) would be, to Brand Persons with it, for every unsound Expression.
 This is wonderful Cautious and Discreet! But they had not all this Mo-
 deration

deration, when they Branded all the Christian World, in Heaps, as Apostates, Conjurers, Devils, from the Days of the Apostles, for those same Doctrines, which they now Pretend to hold themselves. They Excommunicated John Story, John Wilkinfon, and many more with them, for not submitting to the Jurisdiction of their Womens Meetings, as an Ordinance of Christ, which was first Invented by George Fox. And they have since Past the same Sentence upon G. Keith, for not Retracting what he had wrote against the Corruption of their Doctrines. But, as to the Broad and Impious Blasphemy of Sol. Eccles, That must pass, at the most, among other Unsound Expressions: And they must not judge so severely, and Brand Persons, for every Unsound Expression. No, not for Every one; and it seems this must go for a Peccadillo amongst the Rest. There never was, surely, such a Company of Good-Natur'd Forgiving People! They can slip over, cover, and excuse the Lewdest Blasphemies, in a Charitable way! Nothing can Provoke them! They would not Censure any, or Give an Ill Name for the World! They can see no Faults in their own Friends! G. W. says of this very Passage of Sol. Eccles, that it was so Harmless, as might have satisfied any Spiritual or Unbaffed Mind, (this is in his *Light and Life*, before quoted, p. 58.) And if so, it was Perfectly Innocent and Harmless indeed: And must satisfy the Friends that no Reproof was meant against it by G. W. though something (so seeming) must be said, by way of Policy, to stop the Clamours of All Christian People. It was this which put T. E's Wit upon the stretch; and it found out, at last, that Distinction above nam'd, betwixt the Blood of Christ, which was shed upon the Cross, before and after He was Dead; which helps not their Cause, but has made it worse, as before is shewn. But, tho' Sol. Eccles names the Blood shed after He was Dead; yet he makes no Distinction betwixt that, and what was shed Before (which T. E. now Ingeniously puts upon him) But meant it, in the true Quaker Notion of the outward and Material Blood, whether shed Before or After Death, in opposition to their Notion of the Inward Blood, shed in their Hearts. For Sol. Eccles says, in the same Letter, That none of you (Baptists, Independents, Presbyterians, and Pope) Understand the Blood of Jesus Christ no more than a Bruit Beast, i. e. They All Understood and Contended for the outward Blood: But of the notion of Inward Blood, of the Light within, they knew no more than Bruit Beasts. Therefore Repent (says he) for God will suddenly overthrow your Faith (i. e. in the outward Blood) and your Imputative Righteousness too; for the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, which He did at Jerusalem, and without the Gates, the Pope, the Episcopal, the Presbyterian, Independants, and Baptists, shall fare alike; and shall sit down in Sorrow, short of the Eternal Rest: But the true Imputative Righteousness of Christ we own; but it is Hid from you

All,

See G. Fox's Great Mystery, p. 89. 98. 111. 153. 158. 175. 217. 219. 226. 253. 267. and 311.

All, Till the Lord do open an Eye within you i. e. To see the Righteousness of The Light within, which is Imputed, that is, as some Learned Quakers have Expounded it (before those I can name) Imputed. Putted within them. Now here, by Sol. Eccles's Words, the Quakers have a Notion of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, which none in the World have but themselves. Others mean by it, The Merits of, and Satisfaction made by the OUTWARD Obedience, and Sufferings of the OUTWARD Jesus, which are Imputed, that is, Apply'd to us, by our INWARD Faith in Him, and Obedience to His Laws. So that here is both Outward and Inward: The Object of our Faith; and Meritorious, Procuring Cause of our Redemption wholly outward, or without us, i. e. The Man, who is also God, Christ Jesus: The Inward is the Application or Imputation of His Righteousness, or Full and Compleat Obedience to the Law of God; and Undergoing the Curse of it, as the Satisfaction Required for our Transgressions of it; Apprehended and fully Believed on in our Hearts. Now the Quakers opposing this, by setting up the Inward, shews that they wholly throw off the outward: Else, they do not oppose this. But T. E. would fain have it to pass, That they only speak against those, who wholly throw off the Inward, which none ever did. He says p. 121. That they oppose those only, who Deny Him (Christ) to be, with Respect to these Offices, At all within, and shut Him Wholly out, making the Work of Mediation, Sanctification, Justification, and Salvation to be Only and Altogether outward. Who ever made the Work of Sanctification, &c. to be WHOLLY outward? This is the Impudent and Impious Fiction I have so oft taken Notice of, of Imposing the most gross and Notoriously False Principles upon others; that in such a Dust as they have Raised, their own Vile Heresies may Pass Undiscover'd. The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, and the Shedding of His Blood, as above Explain'd, is the Common Belief of Christendom: Now T. E. is Desired to tell us, in his next, what that Blood of Christ was, and what the Imputation which Sol. Eccles said that the Pope, the Episcopal, the Presbyterian, &c. knew no more of than Runit Beasts? What other it could be than the Imaginary Blood and Sufferings of their Light within? If it was any thing else, they will please to tell us.

V. W. Burnet, G. W.'s Antagonist, seeing how they Endeavour'd to depreciate the Outward or Material Blood of Christ, and turn all the Merit of the Redemption of Man to the Inward or Mystical Blood shed within them, argues thus, All things under the Law, in the Type, was Purged with Blood; and this Blood was Material Blood, and not Mystical; and that Blood which Christ shed, in Order to the Effecting the Salvation of Man, must needs be Visible and Material Blood. To this G. W. Replies, as quoted by T. E. p. 118. To say that Material Blood was the Type of that which was Material, is to give the Substance no Preheminence above the Type, nor

like

like as if one should say, one Type was the Type of another. By this G. W. makes Christ's Outward or Material Blood, not to be the Substance or Anti-Type, whereof the Legal Sacrifices were a Type: But that it self is a Type, i. e. of the Mystical Blood, or Light within. And his Proof is, That no Material thing can be the Anti-Type; and therefore that Christ's Material Blood, could be no more than a Type: and therefore that if it was Typified by the Legal Sacrifices, one Type was the Type of another; which he makes the Absurdity. And T. E. Retorts thus upon W. Luraet, p. 122. This is to give the Substance no Preheminence above the Type, when the Substance or Anti-Type is Denied to be Mystical, and made Only Material, because the Type thereof was only Material and not Mystical. Ans. 1st, W. Burnet never said, that Christ was ONLY Material, as if there had been no Mystery in His Incarnation, Passion, &c. no Christian ever said this. This is the Quakers never-failing Artifice of Imposing Manifest Lies upon their Adversaries, that they may Confute them. But W. B. Disputed only against those who would not Allow Christ's outward Material Body and Blood, but only their own Light within to be that which was Typified by the Sacrifices under the Law: and even by the Sacrifice of Christ Himself. 2dly, T. E's Consequence is not good, for supposing that Christ was only Material, it will not follow that His Body had no Preheminence above that of a Bullock, such as was Sacrificed under the Law. And none who had any Reverence for the Body and Blood of Christ, Durst have made such a Blasphemous Comparison. 3dly, None say that the Legal Sacrifices were only Material, and not Mystical; for they were Types of Christ; and so Mystical. So that T. E's Premises are all False; and his Inference not Conclusive. Next he comes to Excuse, that Aphorism of G. W's That one Type cannot be the Type of another. And he says that G. W. in Words following those above cited, applies this to Circumcision. What then? Let him apply it to what else he will. But do's he not apply it, in this place, to Christ? Let any one that can Read English judge.

VI. G. Keith objects, G. W's Explanation of Acts xx. 28. The Church of God, which He Purchased with His own Blood, viz. Now the Blood of God (says G. W.) for that Blood that Relates to God, must needs be Spiritual, He being a Spirit; and the Covenant of God is Inward and Spiritual, and so is the Blood of it. This Excludes the outward Blood of Christ from being the Blood of the New Covenant: And from so much as Relating to God; unless G. W. holds, with the Anthropomorphits and Muggleton; That God is Material and has a Body: For he says, That the Blood of a Spirit can only be Spiritual. To this says T. E. p. 131. will G. Keith say, That the Blood of Christ which was outwardly shed, had no Spirituality in it, nor might, in Any Sense, be called Spiritual, considering the Miraculous Conception of the Body; &c. No. G. Keith, nor any Body else will say so,

so, except such as *T. E. G. W.* &c. And this is nothing at all in Excuse of *G. W.* But exposes him, and his *Stickler* much more. For suppose *Christ's Blood* had some Spirituality in it; and in some Sense might be called *Spiritual*, as the *Spiritual Meat*, and *Spiritual Drink*, and 1 Cor. x. 2, 3. *Spiritual Rock* in the Wilderness: Will this, if there be no more in it, makes *His Blood* to be the *Blood of God*? And what is this to *G. W.*'s Argument, That a Spirit cannot have *Material Blood*? and therefore, That if the *Blood of the New Covenant*, be the *Blood of God*, it cannot be *Material Blood*, i. e. That the *Material Blood of Christ* was not the *Blood of God*; otherwise than as the *Spiritual Meat*, and *Spiritual Drink*; and *All things* are *His*. This lets us into the Heart of the Quaker Divinity.

VII. *G. W.* says in a Book of his call'd, *The Voice of Wisdom*, p. 36. That the *Righteousness* which God effects in us, is not *Finit*, but *Infini*. *T. E.* says p. 113. That these Words are an Inference from a Position of his Adversary, one *Thomas Danson*, viz. That the *Righteousness* whereof *Christ* is the Subject, and that whereof He is the Efficient, are of one Species or Kind. 'Tis true that *G. W.* mentions this. But not as finding any Fault with it: For he says the same and more himself, in the same page, viz. That *Righteousness* which God works in us, by *His Spirit*, is of the same Kind and Nature with that which worketh it; for the *Saints* are made Partakers of the *Divine Nature*, 2 Pet. 1. 4. *T. Danson* made the *Righteousness* of the Man *Christ* of the same Species or Kind with ours, as *His Human Nature* is. But *G. W.* makes the *Righteousness* of God, to be of the same Kind and Nature with ours; which is *Blasphemy*: and far beyond what *T. Danson* had said: with which *G. W.* found no Fault, unless that he had said too little of the Oneness of the *Righteousness* of God and ours: But he brings this former saying of *Danson's* to Confront that Position of his, which *G. W.* sets down, viz. That the *Righteousness* which God works in us, is but *Finit*, as well as other Effects. This *G. W.* opposes, and brings the above-quoted, saying of *Danson's*, as a Contradiction to this: and then Proves against *Danson* (according to his skill) that the *Righteousness* which God effects in us, is not *Finit*, but *Infini*. This is in opposition to the above saying of *Danson's*, That it was but *Finit*. And if *G. W.* thought it but *Finit*, why did he oppose *Danson* in this? But he not only says that it is *Infini*, but goes on to Prove it. For (says he) *Christ* is God's *Righteousness*; and *Christ* is formed in us, Gal. iv. 19. Thus miserably Perverting the Scripture. But they are Desir'd to tell us, how *Infini* can be Formed? 2dly, How formed in that which is *Finit*? *G. W.* in the same place, Exclaims against those who would make that *Righteousness* in them (the *Saints*) but *Finit*. When as (says he) *Christ* His *Infini* *Righteousness*, and the *Saints* are in one another. - Here he makes the *Righteousness* of

of *Christ*, and of the *Saints* to be the same; and corrupts that *Text*, *Heb. ii. 11.* to Prove it, which he Repeats thus, *He that Sanctifies, and they that are Sanctified, are one.* Whereas the *Text* is, *are all of one* & *are* *in* *one*. And concludes thus: *Then God's Righteousness in us, is not Limit, but Infinite.* Yet *T. E.* would make us believe, that he said no such thing. But this is no Novelty with him.

VIII. Again, p. 134. he justifies this saying of *G. W's*, *That Blood and Water that's said to Cleanse, is not of another Kind, but agrees in one with the Spirit.* And Demands, in great assurance, *Is not that True?* No. *Mr. E.* it is not True, but far from Truth, That the Blood and Water are not of another Kind from the Spirit. They are Material and outward Blood and Water, which, through the operation of the Blessed Spirit, do cleanse. But this makes them not of the same Kind with the Spirit more than *Christ's* Human Nature is of the same Kind with His Divine Nature; or than a Man's Body is of the same Kind or Nature with his Soul. And this still shews more and more your Contempt and Denial of the outward and Material Body and Blood of *Christ* for your Justification.

IX. *T. E.* p. 136. brings in *W. Penn* justifying this saying of *Isaac Pennington*, viz. *Can outward Blood Cleanse the Conscience?* And *W. P.* says, *We do Deny that outward Blood can be brought into the Conscience, to Perform that Inward Work: which they themselves (i. e. the Professors, as the Quakers call'd their Opponents) Dare not, nay, do not hold.* Yet *T. E.* says, p. 135. that *Isaac Pennington* put this Question (*Can outward Blood cleanse the Conscience?*) to the Professors, who place ALL upon the OUTWARD. You must Excuse him, he Began, and was Resolv'd to go Quite through with this Topick, in every Case, to Misrepresent his Adversaries Meaning; and if he cannot Find Faults, to Make them. But here he stands fairly Corrected by the more Ingenious *W. P.* (whose Authority he Pretends to Maintain) who says that the Professors Dare not, nay Do not hold this.

G. Keith, as quoted by *T. E.* p. 137. has given a clear Answer to this poor Subterfuge of Supposing that any did think the outward and Material Blood of *Christ* was to be brought into the Conscience; and there Materially Apply'd: which none, sure, in this World ever Imagin'd. *G. K.* says, *The way that Blood has been brought into my Conscience, is by the Application of a Living Faith in Christ, whose Blood it was, the Spirit of God working that Faith in me.* This is Full and Orthodox. But says *T. E.* in answer to this, *Why do's he say,* The way that Blood has been brought into my Conscience, as if it had been Really and Materially brought in there? This is Intolerable! and shews that they either can not, or will not take an Answer. *T. E.* p. 136. tells of a Distinction which *W. P.* made betwixt the Pardon of Past Sin; and the Present Sanctification of

any Person: and applies it to this Purpose, as if the outward Blood of Christ could have no Tendency but only to the Former. But this, instead of Solving the Matter, serves only to Discover the strange Confusion and Ignorance of these Men in the Mystery of the Gospel: as if Christ's Blood, outwardly shed, were not as Effectual to our Sanctification, as to our Justification; to Procure for us, the Graces of the Holy Spirit towards Living acceptably to God for the Future, as the Pardon of Sins that are Past.

SECT. 3.

Concerning the Resurrection of the Body.

I. T. E. is in Great Confusion upon this Head, making Tedious Repetition, and long Digressions about the Bush, not knowing what to say; and yet that he might appear to say something. But I will Reduce his Immethodical Ramblement into this Order. 1st, To shew his weak and Fallacious Excuse for that Great Opposition which the Quakers have given to this Article of our Faith. 2^{dly}, That T. E. instead of Vindicating others, has himself down-right oppos'd this Article of the Resurrection.

First. His Excuse for the Quakers opposition to the Doctrine of the Resurrection. He would (as in Former Cases) Deceive his Readers, by Supposing, against all Sense and Reason, That we so understood the Resurrection, as if the Body were to Rise in the same Grossness and Carnality that it has in this Life. And that this was all that they oppos'd.

But such a gross Notion of the Resurrection no Christian ever held. And G. Keith has sufficiently Explain'd himself, even as quoted by T. E. p. 145. 146. That the Body, when Raised again shall be the same, as to Substance, but not as to the Grossness and Carnality as now; and did Illustrate it by the Chymical Extraction of Spirits out of Herbs, &c. and by the Change that is wrought in the White and Yolk of an Egg, whereof a Chicken is made out of the same Substance. Yet T. E. will not understand him: But gives us a Dull Piece of Buffoonry, and tells him, p. 147. That if he and G. K. were Fellow-Commoners at a Chicken, he would take the Substance, and leave the Rest to G. K. And p. 148. That to make his Instance of the Extraction of Spirits, to be Parallel with the Notion of the Resurrection which the Quakers oppos'd, the Gross Body of the Herbs, which he says, may be made so Subtile and Volatile, must still remain the same Gross Body of Herbs; that it was before, notwithstanding of its almost unconfinable subtilty by Chymical Operation. And, in the same page, Explaining what sort of Resurrection they oppos'd, says, We have always Denied

Denied the Body which shall be Raised, to the same Body that Dyed, with Respect to GROSSNESS and CARNEITY; Which all that they oppose Denied as much as they. And p. 145. he says, That which W. Penn reputed as absurd was, that a Body should be Changed from an Earthly or Animal Body, to an Heavenly Body, and yet, after such Change, continue to be the same Earthly or Animal Body that it was before. And Mr. Penn might Repute this to be Absurd. And Disprove it Effectually, and get the Victory over it: and Triumph! But he can name no body, that ever held any such Absurdity. That an Earthly Body, Changed into an Heavenly Body, may be the same Body, it is True: But that it should be the same Earthly Body, none ever said. It is a Contradiction, it is to say that it is Changed, and not Changed. But how is it possible (says Mr. Penn, *ibid.*) that it should be the same, and not the same? Very easily. Is Mr. Penn the same Man, as before he turn'd Quaker? No sure. There is a Great Change wrought in him. Yet it is the same W. Penn; or else He never Changed. But, says he, in his Reason against Railing, p. 134. If a thing can yet be the same, and notwithstanding Changed; for shame let us never make so much stir against the Doctrine of Trans-substantiation; for the Absurdity of it, is rather out-done, than Equall'd by this Carnal Resurrection. But Mr. Penn is so far out in his Reasoning here, That a thing being Changed shews it to be the same. If you Dye one piece of Cloth, it is no change, in another piece of Cloth: And it were no change in the Cloth, if it was not the same Cloth that was changed. And if Mr. Penn thinks Trans-substantiation a Less Absurdity than this, we may yet see another change in him. But, to return to T. E. Notwithstanding of all that can be said or Done, he still holds to it, That we believe no Change of the Body in the Resurrection, and puts it upon G. Keith, p. 143. So that it seems (says he) according to G. Keith, it must be a Terrestrial Elementary Body, after it is Re-united to the Soul in Heaven. Though G. Keith has not only said, but Argu'd to the Contrary, even as quoted, in the same place, by T. E. Therefore we see he is Resolv'd. He will not Budge an Ace! It must and shall be so! For otherwise, the Quakers are Undone: Because if this be not the Notion of the Resurrection which they oppose; then there is nothing left, but that they down-right oppose that Doctrine of the Resurrection, which has been all along Receiv'd in the Catholick Church; and makes one of the Articles in her Creed. But this will yet further appear in the second Point, viz. That T. E. has not only Negatively, as in the first Point; but even Affirmatively, and in Plain Terms, Deny'd the Resurrection, in this his seeming Vindication of it. By the Resurrection, as ever Understood in the Church, is Meant the Resurrection of the same Body which Dyed. It is not otherwise a Re-surrection, i. e. a Rising again. For that cannot Rise which never Lay down: and that which was not Before, cannot be Again. The Quakers will sometimes say, as T. E. p. 151, that there is

a *Resurrection*, and that of *Bodies*: and that there is an *Heavenly Body*: Because these are Express words of *Scripture*. But they Deny the *Resurrection* of our *Dead Bodies*: Or that ever they will be made *Heavenly Bodies*. What they Mean by a *Heavenly Body*, themselves, nor all the World can tell. One of their *She-Preachers* told a Friend of mine, That it was the *Holy Ghost*. But that they Deny the *Resurrection* of the same Body which *Dyed*, T. E. makes very Evident, p. 149. where he Disputes, That the *Natural* and the *Spiritual Body* are Two Distinct Bodies; and not the same Body, in Different States and Qualifications. Thus he Explains the *Apostle's* words, 1 Cor. xv. 44. He does not say, *The Natural is made a Spiritual Body*; or the *Natural Body* and the *Spiritual Body* is but one and the same Body: but he sets them in opposition, as Two Distinct Bodies. And *The Body* (says he) that is put into the *Grave*, is a *Natural Body*; but the Body that is Raised, is a *Spiritual Body* — and that none might think this *Spiritual Body* was the same, he adds, *There is a Natural Body, and there is a Spiritual Body*. Thus T. E. understands that *Scripture*, and goes on to Prove it further by the Comparison of the first and second *Adam*; and says that the *Spiritual* and *Natural Body*, are no more the same Body, than the first and second *Adam* are the same Man, i. e. than *Christ* and *Adam* are the same.

And to shew their utter Ignorance of the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, T. E. p. 140. &c. quotes *W. Penn.* and *G. W.* and joins with them himself, in Proposing as a Great Absurdity, that the *Soul* hath not its Perfect and Compleat Happiness, before its Re-Union with the *Body*: and Ridicules this, by saying that the Deceased Saints are in *Heaven* but by Halves: That the *Soul* is in a state of *Widowhood*, which is a sort of *Purgatory*: And that it is *Unequal* the *Soul* should be Rewarded so long before the *Body*, its Beloved Companion. But it is rather Punished, if it be in *Purgatory*, as these Men presume to Banter. And why (say they) must the *Felicity* of the *Soul* Depend upon the *Body*? I suppose they mean but in Part, as a *Widower* may have some Happiness, tho' Great Grief with it. But why not upon that *Body* it had before, as well as upon a *New Body*? For let me ask these *Quakers*, who say that the *Soul* will have a *Body* in *Heaven*; tho' not the same *body* it had before: will that *New Body* be any Addition of Happiness, or Advantage to the *Soul*? If not. To what Purpose is it? But if so, then is the *Soul* in an Imperfect State before it gets that *Body*: and all the *Quaker* Objections Return upon themselves. Let them then speak out, and own the True *Quaker* Opinion, viz. That the *Soul* do's Receive that *Heavenly Body* Immediately after *Death*. Nay, I have heard some say, That they had it already: and all the *Resurrection* that ever they expect. Indeed, they know not what they mean by it: and that *Heavenly Body* which they talk of, most of them understand nothing by it; but the *Soul* it self; or an *Heavenly Frame* or *Disposition* of the *Soul*: which

which they think they have attain'd already; or, may be, some of them may think, they may have it in an Higher Measure, after their Death. And this is all the *Resurrection*, and all the *Heavenly Body*, that they Mean, when they use these Words.

II. T. E. p. 153. brings in the subject of their *Infallibility*; and stands stoutly by it. G. Keith had objected against this out of a Book of G. W's, call'd *The Voice of Wisdom*, before mentioned, where G. W. Boldly avers, p. 33. That they that want *Infallibility*—they are out of the Truth; and their Ministry is not of the Spirit; seeing they speak not from the Spirit, but from their own Hearts, which are Deceitful where they want *Infallibility*. And their Common Salvo, to those they would Impose upon, That they only Plead for the *Infallibility* of the Spirit, i. e. of God (which none ever Deny'd) will not do, in this Place: For p. 32. Danson, whom G. W. opposes, had put his Objection so Clear as to obviate that Distinction: His words are these, *As for your Participation of the Infallible Spirit (if that were granted) that Implies not a Participation of the Spirit's Infallibility.* As indeed it do's not, more than of its *Omnipotence*, *Omniscience*, or any other of the *Divine Attributes*, But G. W. do's violently oppose this, and says, most Ignorantly, that *This tends to Divide the Spirit from its Infallibility, as if such as Partake of the Spirit, do not Partake of its Infallibility, was there ever such Folly as this?* Truly I think not; nor such Mad *Enthusiastical* Delusion ever heard of before in the World: For they may Pretend to Partake of God's *Omnipotence*; by the same Reason; and wish as much *Justice*. Was W. P. *Infallible*, in not only saying, but Printing it, That *Christ was born at Nazareth*? Or, if there was an Error in the *Press*, and *Nazareth* put for *Bethlehem*, from the Likeness of the Words; was T. E. *Infallible*, in Printing this over again (as before is told) without Correcting of it? Were these *Quakers* *Infallibly* Guided into the Meaning of that Scripture, *Matth. xi. 30. My Yoke is easie, and my Burden is Light*, who quoted it, at a Conference, before those whom I know, as a Proof for their *Light within*? A little Human Learning would have done well here, to have understood the Meaning of the word *ταρος* in this Text, which signifies *Light*, not as oppos'd to *Darkness*, but to *Weight* or a *Burden*: which common sense much less *Infallibility* could not have mistaken in this Text. Was William Walker (a Great Quaker Preacher) *Infallible*, who mistook *John xiv. 2. In my Father's House are many Mansions*, for In my Father's House are many *Manchets*. And made the Application, what Plenty of Provision was in Heaven, fine White Bread, little *Manchets*, and Many of them? This I have from those who heard him: and heard other *Quakers* Improving upon his Doctrine, what Fine Bread there was in God's House. Innumerable Instances of the Like Ignorance might be Given; and of Lying Prophecies, the Rankest Treasons, and Blasphemies, Pronounced In The Name of the Lord: for which I Refer the Reader to *The Snake in the Grass*, where he will find a Plentiful Collection of them; and Undeniyably Vouched.

Now

Now *George Fox* (their *First and Great Apostle*) in his *Answer to the Westmorland Petition*, 1653. p. 5. says, *All you that Speak, and not from the Mouth of the Lord, are False Prophets.* And in his *Saul's Errand*, &c. 1654. p. 7. says, *They are Conjurors and Diviners; and their Preaching is from Conjururation that is not spoken from the Mouth of the Lord.* If *G. Fox* told a *Lye* in this, then by his own Rule, he was a *Conjurer*, because he spoke not from *The Mouth of The Lord.* And if he spoke *Truth.* He is as much a *Conjurer*, and all the *Quaker Preachers* with him, who either *Preached False Doctrine*, or *Mis-understood*, or *Mis-apply'd* any *Text of Scripture*, or any other *Man's Meaning* (of which we have pretty Broad Instances now before us) because *No Mistake*, of any sort, can come from *The Mouth of The Lord.*

S E C T. 4.

of Christ's Coming to Judge the Quick and the Dead.

I. *George Whitehead* says, as quoted, p. 160. Now what is that *Glory of the Father*, in which His (Christ's) coming is? Is it visible to the *Carnal Eye*? And when was that coming to be? Is it now to be looked for outwardly? But further we do acknowledge the several Comings of Christ, according to the Scriptures, both that in the *Flesh*, and that in the *Spirit*, which is *Manifest in several Degrees*, as there is a *Growing from Glory to Glory*: But *Three Comings of Christ*, not only that in the *Flesh at Jerusalem*, and that in the *Spirit*; but also another *Coming in the Flesh*, yet to be *Expected*, we do not Read of, but a *Second Coming without Sin unto Salvation*, which in the *Apostles days* was looked for. The *First Coming* of Christ he confesses to be that in the *Flesh at Jerusalem.* The *Second* he makes to be His *Inward Coming into our Hearts*; which, he says, was looked for in the days of the *Apostles*, i. e. Christ was so *come*, at that time, in their *Hearts.* But the *Coming to the Future Judgment* he calls the *Third Coming*; and this he *Utterly Denys.* And *T. E.* Endeavours to support him by *Matth. xvi. 28.* where Christ said, *That some standing there should not taste of Death, till they saw the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom*, i. e. till the *Destruction of Jerusalem*; which was a *Glorious Manifestation of the Power of Christ*, in *Fulfilling those Judgments* which he had *Threatned upon the Jews.* And it was likewise a *Type of the Final Judgment and Destruction of the World.* But *T. E.* knowing nothing of this, would understand those *Scriptures* which speak of *Christ's coming to Judgment*, to mean only His *Inward Coming in the Heart*; which he calls His *Second Coming.* This is the *Meaning of those Questions* above quoted. Is it visible to the *Carnal Eye*? And when was that *Coming to be*? Is it now to be looked for outwardly? &c. By which it is plain, that they mean, That there is no visible *Coming of Christ*, to be *Now looked for outwardly.* I have told above, what they mean by a *Glorify'd or Heavenly Body*, not any thing either *Visible or Intelligible.* But if they would consider, that *Christ's Glorify'd*

Glorify'd Body was visible to St. Paul at his Conversion; as to other of His Apostles, at His Trans-Figuration upon the Mount, they would not find such Difficulties in apprehending that He may be Visible at the Last Day, even to outward Eyes, when they shall be strengthened much more than those of the Apostles upon Earth. Then shall the Jews, with their outward Eyes look upon Him whom they Pierced, according to the Literal Prophesie, Zech. xii. 10. And St. Barnabas, in his Cathol. Epist. chap. vii. says, That His Body, tho' Glorify'd, shall then be so Like what it was upon Earth, that they shall be amazed at the Likeness. And he says, That this Likeness was Prefigur'd in the Likeness of the Two Goats, the Scape-Goat, and the other offer'd in Sacrifice, Lev. xvi.

II. T. E. has another Pleasant come off, p. 161. He says that G. W. oppos'd W. Burnet only as to the Opinion of the Millennium, or Thousand Years Reign of Christ upon Earth: and that this was the Third Coming of Christ, which G. W. Denys. Whereas, neither in Burnet nor G. W.'s Book is there one Word of Millennium; or any thing like it; But their Dispute was only concerning the Last Judgment. So that this must pass among the rest of T. E.'s Supposes, to help him out at a Dead Lift.

III. But if T. E. must Down, he is Resolv'd to Fall in Good Company: For p. 162. he makes St. Paul as Fallible as Himself. He supposes that Saint Paul did Expect the Day of Judgment to come in his time, from 1 Thess. iv. 17. We which are alive, shall be caught up in the Clouds, &c. G. Keith says, That the Apostle's using the word We, there, [we that Remain] is an Enallage Personæ, putting [We] for [They] like that of James, Therewith Bless we God; and therewith Curse we Men, James iii. 9. But says T. E. Though he delivers it Positively and like a Dictator, yet I see not why he must needs be believed: Why might not the Apostle speak in the first Person [We] as supposing that Great and Extraordinary Appearance of Christ, was so near at hand, that it might Probably fall out in his time? Why might he not? I'll tell you Why, Mr. Ellwood, Because it did not fall out in his Life time: And if He thought it might, then it will follow that He was mistaken: and consequently that what He wrote was not Truth: and so not only the Authority of this Epistle, but of All His Epistles; and of all the Rest of the New Testament, will fall to the Ground; for did not He write by the same Spirit as the other Pen-Men of the New Testament? And you cannot think to come off by such a Text as 1 Cor. vii. 6. I speak this by Permission, and not of Commandment. For, concerning the other Text, he says Expressly, 1 Thess. iv. 15: This we say unto you, by the Word of the Lord: And if he was mistaken in this, then was He Guilty of Great Blasphemy, to speak a Lye in the Name of Lord: And we cannot Believe one Word of this, or any thing else that he either said or wrote.

I Expect now that T. E. should tell me, That he only made a Quere of this; and put a Perhaps to it: 1st, This was a very Reverend Suppose, to throw down the whole Scriptures all at once! But idly, T. E. goes further

ther than a *Suppose*; for he afterwards *Positively Asserts* it, and endeavours to *Prove* it thus. For as the *Apostles* (says he) accounted the *Times* they Lived in the *Last Days* or *Last Times* — so they thought the *End of the World* was not far off. What else made Paul, when he had told the *Corinthians*, That the things he had Related were written for our *Admonition*, add, Upon whom the *Ends of the World* are come? 1 Cor. xi. 11. Why else did Peter say, The *End of All things* is at Hand? 1 Pet. iv. 7.

And now I am come to vindicate the *Apostles* against T. E. He strikes Home! Therefore, let him know, That by the *Later Times*, and the *Last Times* was Understood, The *Last Dispensation* which was to be Given to the World; viz. That of the *Gospel*, or the *Messias*. Which Time was usually called by the *Jews*, the *Αἰὼν ὁ Μέλλων* The *Age* that was to come, or the *Last Age*. But now as to Saint Paul, who seems homely Charged, He has, as foreseeing such misconstruction of his Words, or some having so misconstrued them, fully Clear'd himself, and the other *Apostles*, in a following Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, 2 Thess. ii. 2. Now I beseech you Brethren (says he, with Great Earnestness) by the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; and by our Gathering together unto Him, That ye be not soon Shaken in Mind, or be troubled, neither by Spirit, nor by Word, nor by Letter, as from us, as that the Day of Christ is at Hand. Let no man Deceive you, by any means, for that Day shall not come, except there come a Falling away first, &c. But T. E. will not Believe him, or else he must not believe G. W. who says in a Book he and others wrote, Anno 1659. called *A Brief Discovery of the Dangerous Principles of John Horne*, &c. p. 9. And as for that 1 Thess. iv. 15. concerning the Coming of our Lord from Heaven, which these Men aforesaid would blindly put Afar off — The Saints who then were Alive Remained unto it — so their Conversation was in Heaven (i. e. a Heaven within them; for) they did not say their Conversation was at a Distance off above the Clouds, from whence you look for a Christ — And thence Concludes. That your Faith, which is not Grounded in Christ's Appearing In you, is to be turned up by the Roots. In the Title Page, This Book is said to be wrote, By the Truth which is in George Whitehead, John Whitehead, and George Fox the Younger. I will not Degrade the Reader with Applications. These things are so gross, as not to be made Plainer.

III. The next Quotation is, p. 164 G. W.'s words before mentioned. Dost thou look for Christ's coming again to appear outwardly, in a Bodily Existence? if thou dost, thou mayst look until thy Eyes Drop out, before thou wilt see such an appearance of him. And here T. E. cries out of Fraud and Falseness in G. Keith, for leaving out these Words, as the Son of Mary, Dost thou look for Christ, as the Son of Mary, to appear, &c. which mean no more than Christ, in His true Human Nature; and the same Body which He took of the Blessed Virgin, in opposition to the Quaker Notion of understanding Christ's Coming only of the Inward and Invisible Appearance or Manifestation

of *Christ in the Heart*. And T. E's. objecting against this, of *Christ's coming, as the Son of Mary*, do's further Confirm us, that these *Quakers* do not mean his coming in His true *Human*, and *Outward Body*. T. E. Objects too, that these words, to *save thee*, are not Repeated in this Second Quotation of G. W's Words. Which has been spoke to before, and so I dismiss this head, as I do likewise a long Contest, which lasts as far as p. 177. Concerning some *Letters*, and other Papers in MS. which G. Keith Produced, full of the *Heretical Delusions* before mentioned: And which T. E. Confesses and Denies, as if he were *Mumbling of Thistles*; and Interlards with *Billings-Gate* against G. Keith: With which I do not meddle. And having Proofs sufficient out of their Printed Books; I will not trouble the Reader with Examining of their *Manuscripts*:

IV. T. E. Comes to defend himself. p. 177. And a Quotation of his own, which G. Keith cited, *Viz. In comparing the Books of Friends, to the Books of them called the Greek and Latin Fathers*, he (G. K.) has not done as a *Friend and Brother*, but as an *Enemy*, in supposing *Friends Books to have been Written by no better Guidance, nor clearer sight, than theirs, who Lived and Wrote in those Dark times*. T. E. is very Angry that the *Auditors at Turners-Hall*, shouted at this Quotation. And well they might. To see the most *Ignorant and Heretical* of all the *Sects* that ever were in *Christendom*, thus to set up themselves above the *Primitive Fathers* of the Church; and to Prefer their own Writings, who could not rightly spell their own Mother Tongue, (*Illiterate Mechanics!*) to the Great *Atbanasius*, *Basilius*, the two *Gregories* (*Naziansen* and *Nysen*) *Cyril*, *Ambrose*, *Epiphanius*, *Chrysostom*, *Hierom*, *Augustin*, *Hikarius*, &c. All of whom T. E. Instances, by Name, p. 178. As *Inferior to the Quakers*; and ascends Higher, to the Second Century, and p. 179. Names *Cyprian*, *Tertullian*, and *Origen*. None of these were to be compar'd with *George Fox*, and his *Disciples*! These were *Dark Times*, to the Year 1650, when the *New Light* of the *Quakers* Arose in our Hemisphere! When (the Church being Pull'd down) the *Vilest*, and most *Wicked*, and *Numerous* Spawn of *Multifarious Sects*, that ever the *Bottomless Pit* spew'd forth, at once, were, with a *Thousand* other *Devils*, let loose amongst us! A just Punishment for our *Schism* and *Rebellion*! And we are yet left to War with the *Taylor* of this *Hydra*, which is *Gathering New-Life*; and if it shou'd (for our sines) Prevail, our *Last State* would be worst than the *First*. Who can refrain from *Indignation*! To see such a *Conceited*, senseless, most *Ignorant and Blasphemous Crew*, *Destitute of Common Modesty or Shame*, wipe their Mouths, and Gravely set up themselves above all the *Glorious Lights* of the Church, *Confessors* and *Martyrs*, ever since the *Apostles*; whom they *Damn* as *Apostates*! As their *Execrable Father* G. Fox said, in his *Great Mystery*. p. 89. *That the Quakers Have a Spirit given them beyond all the Fore-fathers, since the days of the Apostles, in the Apostacy*. T. E. Quotes

See Snake in the Grass 2. Part Sect iv.

scraps

u a
a a can
na

straps out of *Perkins, Turret, and Dalley*, to shew *Errors* in the *Fathers*, who did not pretend to *Infallibility*. Tho' these *Modern Authors* have made much too Bold with them (There are *Spots* in the *Sun*). But this must not *Eclipse* their *Light*; and *Glorious Gifts* they had from *God*; whereby they supported His *Gospel*, with *Irresistible Learning, Piety, and Constancy*, even to the *Death*. *God* charged His *Angels* with *Folly*; and suffer'd *Imperfections* in

His *Apostles*. *Peter* Deserv'd to be *Blamed*; and even *Barnabas* *Gal. 2. 11.* was carry'd away with his *Disimulation*. There were great Failings in *Noah*, in *Lot*, in *Moses*, in *Samson*, in *David*, in *Solomon*. And the *Quakers* (who, while in the sink of *Heresy* and *Corruption*, Boast of a *Sinless Perfection*) may set themselves above all these; by the same Rule. But what is so *Extravagant*, that they dare not, that they have not done! *William Shewen* (a Great *Quaker* Writer and Preacher; and Highly Extoll'd by them, at his solemn *Funeral* about two years ago) in his *Treatise concerning Thoughts and Imaginations*. Printed 1685. p. 25. Sets up a *Quaker*, as *Meeker* than *Moses*, *Stronger* than *Samson*, *Wiser* than *Solomon*, And more *Patient* than *Job*—*Harmless* and *Innocent* as *He* (*Christ*) was. If the Reader be *Astonish'd* at this; he will see more. p. 37. Where the *Quakers* pretend to be come even beyond the *Outward Christ*, or *Jesus*; They can come to *God* now without *Him*; And worship *Him* no more. Not to *Jesus* (says he on the *Margent*, that you may take the more Notice of it) The *Son* of *Abraham*, *David*, and *Mary*, *Saint* or *Angel*, but to *God*, the *Father*, all *Worship Honour and Glory* is to be *Given*, thro' *Jesus Christ*, i. e. Thro' the *Inward Christ*, or *Light within*. But to *Worship* the *outward Jesus*, the *Son* of *Mary*, he *Ranks* with the *Worship* of *Saints* and *Angels*. And his *Ascension*, and *Sitting* at the *Right Hand* of *God*, *W. Shewen* will not have it understood of the *outward Jesus*, but onely of this *Inward Christ*. p. 38. Who, when he is thus known to perform all these *Offices* in his *People*, he is then, by such, known to sit down at the *Right Hand* of *God*—He is then also known to *Surrender* up the *Kingdom* to the *Father*. And in the *Margin* he puts this Note, *Viz.* This is the *Ascending* of *Christ* up where he was before he *Descended*. Turning all this to the *Inward Christ*, or their *Light within*; Perform'd within them; where they have an *Inward Ascension*, an *Inward Right Hand* of *God*, an *Inward Kingdom*, an *Inward Delivering* of it up, &c. And denying any thing of this to be Perform'd *Outwardly*, or to belong to the *outward Jesus*. Now *T. E.* is desir'd to shew any such *Errors* as these; and the *Denial* of these *Four* great *Essentials* of *Christianity*; which is *Charged* and *Proved* against him, and his *Partners*; and is the *Subject* of our present *Discourse*. 1. *Faith* in *Christ*, as he *Outwardly* suffer'd at *Jerusalem*, to our *Salvation*. 2. *Justification* by his *Blood* *outwardly* shed. 3. The *Resurrection* of the *Dead*. 4. The *Future Judgment*. He is desir'd to shew any such *Errors* as these, in those *Fathers*, whom he so much despises. No. If any had Published such *Doctrines* as these, in those which he calls *Dark Times*, they had been spew'd out of the *Church*, with the utmost *Abhorrence*. Many were

were cast out for much less Errors than these. Nor ought such Errors to be Tolerated in any Christian Nation. And it is an horrible Scandal that such should be suffered to pass under the Name of Protestants. It is enough to make that Name odious to all other Christians. From the Place last Quoted to p. 197. There is nothing but a wrangling Personal Dispute betwixt T. E. and G. Keith, about some Papers Exhibited by the one against the other. All which I pass over. And come to G. Keiths Appendix to his Narrative, which T. E. begins there to Consider.

SECT. V.

The several Charges in the Appendix.

THESE are some further Instances upon the *Four Heads*, which are the Subject of the *Narrative*: And a few other things which come in by the by, and might have been spar'd. But that this Reply may be Full, I proceed to Examine them.

I. A Quotation out of G. W. is set down p. 198. Wherein he denies either the *Soul* or *Body* of Christ to be *Human*, or that he had an *Human Nature*, and he says that the *Blood of God*, with which he purchased his Church, *Act. xx. 28.* Was not the *Blood of the Human Nature*. And where doth the Scripture (says he) call the *Blood of God* *Humane*, or *Humane Nature*? To this T. E. Answers, That Christ, was not of a meer Earthly Extraction: That there was more of *Divinity* even in that *Body*, than in the *Bodies* of other Men. Which none, hardly the *Socinians*, will Deny. But T. E.'s Inference is not Good, That because Christ's *Body* had more *Divinity* in it than other Mens, that therefore it was too Heavenly to be call'd *Humane* or *Earthly*. For the *Hypocritical* or *Personal Union* of his *Human* with his *Divine Nature*, did not Destroy or Swallow up his *Humanity*, as the *Eutychians* held; But his *Human* both *Soul* and *Body*, are still, and for ever, Truly and Properly *Humane*, else he were not Truly and Properly a *Man*. And the not knowing of this has greatly Milled the *Quakers*: Who if they had given themselves, but a little, to *Humane Learning* (which they despis'd, because they had it not) and had known the *Ancient Heresies* which were Condemned by the Church, in several Ages; they wou'd not have fallen in with so many of them, as they have Ignorantly done. T. E. Wou'd not have given such an Answer as he do's here, That Christ's making his *Soul* an offering for Sin, was true, and so it is (says he) in a *figurative Manner of Speaking*, Which was the very Words and Excuse of these *Primitive Hereticks*, who said that Christ's *Passion* was not *Real*, but onely in *Appearance* to Mens Eyes. And, if his *Body* was but a *Vail* or *Garmēt*, wherein he dwelt,

dwell, as the *Quakers* and *Socinians* do make it, then indeed his *sufferings* were no other than *Figurative* or *alse*; and he could no more be said to have been *Crucify'd*, then a Man would be *Crucify'd* if his Cloak or Garment was *Crucify'd*. And thus it must be, if *Christ's* Humane Nature was not *Hypostatically* united to his *Divine* Nature; so as both to make but one Person, as Soul and Body is in *Man*. For otherwise the *Soul* could feel nothing, or be said to suffer for whatever was done to the *Body*. And *T. E's*, Argument, and *G. W's*, which he Recites, is most Ridiculous, that *Christ's* Soul was *Immortal*, and could not be put to *Death*. So is every *Mans*. And when we *Kill* a Man, no body says, that we *Kill* his *Soul*. But as the Separation of *Body* and *Soul* is *Death* to us; So it was; and as Really, to *Christ*: And not onely In a *Figurative* manner of speaking, as *T. E.* (with the Ancient *Hereticks*) do's contend.

II. Page 202. There is a Quotation of *G. W's*, brought, wherein he denies, That there is continual need of Repentance. And *T. E.* Justifies it, by supposing, that the *Quakers* are free from all Sin. Else, there must be Continual need of Repentance. I will not Enter now, upon their most Exploded Title to a *Smless* Perfection (having done it sufficiently elsewhere) I onely mention this now to shew their *Infallible Hardiness* in pretending still to it, after it has been Expos'd even to *Laughter*, and as many *Failings* shewn of these *Perfect, Smless* Creatures, as would make any of the *Prophane* to appear *Ridiculous*. And this Pretence to a *Smless* Perfection, is not the least *Gross* of their *Imperfections*: And shews the *Excess* of their *Spiritual Pride*. For which they may Read their Sentence, 1 *John* 1. 8. If we say that we have no Sin, we deceive our selves; and the Truth is not in us. For, as *Solomon* says, *Prov.* xx. 9. Who can say, I have made my Heart clean, I am pure from Sin?

III. The next Quotation is, p. 202. Where *G. W's*, Perversion of *Isa.* ix. 6. Is set down. He turns that most Express Prophecy of *Christ*, Viz. Untous a Child is born, &c. To an *Allegorical* Sense of *Christ* within, and his being Born in our Hearts. And says that he was thus Born in *Isaiah* himself, who wrote these Words, Who had also been as with Child. Says he, i. e. Of *Christ*. *T. E.* In Defence of this, says, p. 203. That this was meant of Both, Viz. Of *Christ's* Outward and his Inward Birth: but this is false; for the Prophecy was only of his Outward Birth. And if it can be turned to the Inward, how shall we thereby convince the *Jews*, as to the Outward *Christ*? This Liberty of Interpretation will confound all the Prophecies of *Christ* in the Old Testament. And it is Remarkable that *Isaac Penington*, a *Quaker*, having wrote a Book, Intituled, *Some Queries and Answers of deep Concernment to the Jews*, and Design'd purposely for Their Conversion, do's not, through the whole, once Name the outward *Christ*; But bids them onely look to their Light within. *T. E.* Quotes a Book of *G. Keith's* call'd *The Restor Corrected*, p. 30. In Justification of this Exposition of his, of *Isa.* ix. 6. To mean both the

the *Outward* and the *Inward Birth* of *Christ*. And tho my business is not here to Vindicate *G. Keith*, yet I had the Curiosity to look into that Book of his; and find, that this Text was not so much as under Consideration; or once Nam'd, in that place, but he was treating there wholly of another Subject; and which is no ways Applicable to this.

IV. The next Quotation is. p. 207. *G. W.* in his Book call'd *The He Goats Horn Broken* (by way of *Witticism* upon *John Horn*, whom he Answers) p. 33. 34. Charges this (among others) as an Error in *J. Horn*, Viz. That when Paul saith *Christ* was seen of him Last, 1 Cor. xv. 8. He must needs mean it of his Body seen, and seen by Bodily sight. Which is contrary (says *G. W.*) to Gal. i. 16. To this says *T. E.* that if *G. W.* had denied that *Christ* was Bodily seen of Paul, that had not Allegorized away *Christ's* Resurrection. And this is all he says to it. But if *Christ* was not Bodily seen of Paul, then was Paul a false Witness of *Christ*: For, in that Place 1 Cor. xv. He Names himself among other Witnesses to *Christ's* outward Resurrection. He was seen (says St. Paul v. 5.) Of Cephas, then of the Twelve; After that he was seen of above 500 Brethren at once; after that he was seen of James, then of all the Apostles; and last of all, he was seen of me also. Now if he was not seen of Paul, then was he seen of none of the Rest: And so they are all together False-Witnesses. As St. Paul makes the Inference, v. 15. Yea, and We are found False-Witnesses of God; because we have Testified of God, that he Raised up *Christ*: Whom he Raised not up, if so be that the Dead Rise not. But *T. E.* says, quite contrary to this Reasoning of St. Paul, That tho we shou'd deny that *Christ* was Bodily seen of Paul, yet this wou'd not Allegorize away *Christ's* Resurrection. St. Paul thought that it wou'd totally overthrow it, and all our Faith with it. And moreover, That to deny the Resurrection of our Bodies, do's Infer the Denial of *Christ's* Resurrection. As he Argues, ver. 12, &c. Now if *Christ* be Preached, that he Rose from the Dead; how say some among you, that there is no Resurrection of the Dead? But now if there be no Resurrection of the Dead, then is *Christ* not Risen: And if *Christ* be not Risen, then is our Preaching vain, and your Faith is also vain. You see how these Articles of our Creed, the Resurrection of *Christ*, and our Resurrection, are linked so closely together, that they do mutually suppose one another; and taking away of the one, do's destroy the other. Therefore I do Earnestly Recommend it to the Quakers, to Consider from whence they are Fallen; how their Error as to our Resurrection has taken away likewise the Resurrection of *Christ*: And the denial of his outward Resurrection, is Rendering our Faith vain; and overturning the whole Foundations of Christianity: Of which this of the outward Resurrection of *Christ* was the main Pillar: And therefore, in the Choice of one, to succeed *Yudas*, it is said, Act. i. 21. That he must be chosen out of those who had been Eye-Witnesses of *Christ* all along, that he might be a Witness with us (said the Apostles) of *Christ's* Resurrection. This was the Hinge, and very Basis of the Christian Faith. Which the Quaker New Light has wholly overturn'd.

VII. Page 204. The Perversion of that Text *Isa. LIII. 9.* Is instanc'd, *He made his Grave with the wicked,* which *R. Hubbertorn* (of the First Rank of Worthies among the *Quakers*) to favour their Notion of the *Inward Christ*, or *Light within*, *Suffering*, *Dying*, and *Rising* again in the *Heart*, Corrupts thus, *He made his Grave in the wicked.* To this says *T. E.* First, That *R. Hubbertorn* did not mention, *Isa. LIII.* As if a Man might not Repeat a Text, and that it were not usual, without Quoting Chapter and Verse. Secondly, He says, that *R. H.* was not there treating Of the General Resurrection, or the Resurrection of the Body. His words are, *Christ the Seed made his Grave in the wicked, and in the Rich in his Death; and out of that Grave shall rise with his Body into Everlasting Life.* And adds, *If thou canst Receive it, thou mayest be satisfied.* Right! *If thou canst Receive it!* There you are pretty secure. For who can Receive such Unintelligible Jargon! *T. E.* is desir'd to tell us, what they mean by the *Christ* or *Light within* Rising out of the *Wicked*, into *Everlasting Life.* But to his Answer. He says this was not spoken of the Resurrection; whereas it is Plain, that it was spoken of the Resurrection, and of nothing else. Unless he will say, that by *Rising* out of the *Grave*, they do not mean a Resurrection; and so give us a New Language; and have secret meanings of their own for words, that no body may understand them. Which I am afraid is the Case.

VI. Here follows a War about Contradictions in *G. W.* with which I will not meddle; thinking it not worth a Victory to find Contradictions in him. But I will onely mark where he discovers his Principles as to Religion. As at the end of p. 205. and beginning of p. 206. *Did G. W.* (says *T. E.*) ever call or own *Christ's Body*, now in *Heaven*, or while it was on *Earth*, to be Terrestrial, or of the *Earth*? Then it was not a true *Human Body*, while on *Earth*, or now in *Heaven*: And *Christ* was not then, nor is now Truly and Really a Man. But of this enough before.

VII. Page 207. *T. E.* makes a nice Distinction betwixt *Summoning God* as a Witness, as he words it, and declaring such a thing as truth In the Presence of God. He says, one is an Imprecation, especially the words *So help me God*; but that the other is not. But when I declare a thing as In the Presence of God, is there not an Imprecation imply'd, if I speak False? But this touches a sore place of the *Quakers*. For there was nothing wherein they were more Positive, than of the Unlawfulness of Attesting God, in whatsoever Form, in any Worldly business, or going beyond plain *Yea* or *Nay*. And that every such Attestation was by them counted an Oath; and utterly Forbidden under the Gospel. What! say they, in a Treatise of Oaths, Presented to King and Parliament. 1673. Signed by *William Pen*, *George Whitehead*, and 11 more p. 17. make God, the great God of *Heaven* and *Earth*, our Caution in worldly Controversies, as if we wou'd bind him to obtain our own Ends!

Ends: It is to make too bold with him, &c. And p. 74. putting the Question. What shall we say is beyond Yea and Nay? Ans. Without doubt, an Oath. And in their Book call'd A Positive Testimony against all Swearing under the Gospel. Printed 1692. p. 23. The Appealing (after any manner) to God as a Judge, or any ways using his sacred Name, or Mentioning any thing whereby it may be imply'd as by Heaven, Earth, &c. When Relating onely to Human, Worldly and Inferior matters, may be Granted to be an OATH. And p. 31. How can any Invoke God for a Witness, or any other Purpose; or any ways Imploy or use his sacred Name, for a security in Earthly matters, if it was not a PROPER OATH? And p. 39. From hence it may be seen an Invincible Reason against Swearing, and the Naming or using God's sacred Name, any ways, to Confirm the Truth of my Speech, Relating to Human and Worldly matters. And p. 46. 47. With what Face or Presence can any that sincerely Profess Christianity take any Oath, or use any Higher Expressions, for Confirming Human and Temporal matters, than Christ's Evangelical sentence of Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay; or what is Equivalent thereto? And what Christian Men or Magistrates, or Powers of the Earth can Lawfully Prescribe or Require more than Christ hath Permitted herein? Yet all this Notwithstanding, they have, the very last Session of Parliament, not onely submitted, but Imploy'd their Interest to obtain; and when opposition was made, struggled hard; and at last Prevail'd for an Act of Parliament, that they shou'd be admitted to use in Temporal Courts, and for Worldly matters, this Form of giving their Evidence, In the Presence of the Almighty God, the Witness of the Truth of what I say. For they found themselves Pinch'd in their Temporal Affairs (which at first, were very small, when they set up their Principle against Swearing; But since are grown very Considerable; and they have now as large a share of Mammon, as most in the Kingdom, which is often Risqued) by their refusing to Swear in matters of Law: And they have hit upon this Medium to Reconcile their Interest, and their Consciences together. But which has got the better, I leave the Reader to Judge. However, to qualify the latter a little, they have since Published a Collection of Testimonies out of the Writings of their Ancient Friends (wherein all Contradictions are to be found) to justify their present Proceedings, which with the opposite Testimonies (some whereof are above Recited) are Printed by John Pennymann, who remain'd a Member of their Fraternity, till such Contradictory Practises as these drove him from them.

VIII. Page 209. T. E. excuses W. Pen for saying, That to deny the Locality of Heaven and Hell was not very offensive; by giving this Definition of Locality; viz. Certain particular Places or Parts of the World, set out, bounded and limited to any certain and determinate Dimensions. Well: How does this excuse it? If this be so, then is not Christ's Body in any certain place, bounded and limited to any certain and determinate Dimensions; i. e. in no place at all; for all space is thus determined and limited: else it were not space. And

And if *Christ's Body* be in no Place, then has he no *Body*; for every *Body* must be in some place or other. And if this be not offensive, then what can be? But *T. E.* says, 2dly, p. 210. That *W. P.* only said, it was not very offensive. Which shews (says *T. E.*) that he held it to be offensive, and was offended at it. Goodly! Goodly! Very angry he was indeed! But why not very offensive? Is the taking away any outward, that is, any *Local Heaven or Hell*, and the Truth of *Christ's Human Body*, but a *Little* offensive! No. But very *Pleasing* to the *Quaker* Light within, which would turn all these inward; and make but an *Allegory* of them. And in this case, not very offensive, means the same as not offensive at all. And it is a *Common Phrase*; especially when we would *Excuse* any thing; and to *Insinuate* our *Liking*, at least, not *Dislike* of it: Particularly where the *Case* is such, that our open and *Positive Commendation* might be ill taken. It is like *Sounding* the *Depth* of the *Water*, that we may know how far we can go without danger. But if these be such small offences, and easily past over, I would fain know what those *Monstrous* things are, for which the *Church of England*, and other *Professions* have been *Stigmatiz'd* by the Name of *Baals Priests*, *Devils Incarnate*, and such like *Appellations*, with which I will, *Darby* no more of my *Paper*? Why, verily for *Preaching* up the *Locality* of *Heaven and Hell*, and of the *Body of Christ*, now *Locally* in that *Local Heaven*: And thus *Running* out from the *Quaker Allegorical Doctrine*, of finding all these within us, and no where else. This is the *Grand Quarrel* the *Quakers* have against us. For they can Name none other.

IX. There is another Position which gave very little offence to *W. P.* as *Sorting* with a most *Blasphemous* and *Absurd* Notion of the *Quakers*, that the *Soul of Man* is a *Part* of *God*. Which is fully prov'd in *The State in the Grass*. Part 2. Sect VII. Where *G. Fox's* words are Quoted, making our *Soul* of the same *Person* and *Substance* with *God*, without *Beginning* or *Ending*, and *Infinite* in it self, to be one *Soul* with *God*, a *Part* of his *Substance*, *Person*, *Essence*, and *Being*. But this is something *Mollified*, as to the *Expression*, in that which *T. E.* says, p. 210. Was not very offensive to *W. P.* Viz. *Assigning* to it (the *Soul* of *Man*) *Something* more of *Divinity* than the usual opinion doth. What was that *Something*? And what more of *Divinity* is it which the *Quakers* ascribe to the *Soul*, than the usual opinion doth? The *Divinity* is not *Divided*; and therefore if we *Truely* and *Properly* partake of any *Part* of it, we partake of it *All*. *Man's Soul* was *Breathed* from *God*: and made a *Glorious image* of him; and *Partook* of many *Excellent* and *Endowments* which were *Communicated* to it by *God*: All this *The usual opinion* doth ascribe to the *Soul*. But what more is it, which the *Quakers* would have? Even what I have above told you out of the *Founder* of their Faith, *G. Fox*. And if this had not been *Pleasing* to *W. P.* he would not have been a *little* offended at those *General Expressions* which lead

lead to this; and which do imply all this. He would not have ascribed more of Divinity to the Soul than the usual opinion doth; since that more is Rank Blasphemy. But this he wrote in his Younger days, in the First Flights of his Zeal, and New Conversion to Quakerism; when the Fashions of that Spirit were Fresh and Vigorous. But I hope, and desire to believe that he will do it no more. And that he gives T. E. little thanks for these *Lame Defences* which he has made for him.

X. The next thing observable, is the Quakers Notion of a Church, which T. E. p. 210. Says must not be taken with Respect to Particular Persons (the Faithful or Believing) but with Respect to a Gathered People; which (says he) is both the Common and True Notion of a Church. And, in this sense he boldly stands to it, that the Quakers are the only Church of Christ upon the Earth. And says, p. 211. That this is no Presumption in them to affirm, nor ought to be offensive to others to bear, since we (says he) therein Claim no more to our selves, than every other Body of Professed Christians claim to themselves: Namely, that they, and they onely (as a Gathered People) are the true Church of Christ. But of all these Bodys of Christians which T. E. Names, I know of none with whom the Quakers do joyn in this, but onely the Church of Rome. For the Church of Rome onely (except the Quakers) make themselves the Catholick Church, excluding all others (as a Gathered People) who are not of their Communion. But the Church of England never yet call'd her self The Catholick Church, or excluded others, even as a Gathered People, from being Members of The Church. The most Rigid for Episcopacy, allow all Episcopal Churches, to be Included within the Denomination of The Church; which Appellation none of them (Rome onely Excepted) do confine to their own Church. And this brings in the Churches of Denmark, Sweden, and vast Empire of Russia in Europe; the whole Greek Church, spread far both in Europe and Asia; the Numerous Churches of the Christians in the East Indies, where St. Thomas the Apostle Planted the Christian Faith; and they derive themselves from him: And the large Region of the Dissents in Africa. All which Churches are, and ever have been Episcopal. And do far outnumber all the Anti-Episcopal Communions in Britain, Holland, Switzerland, Piemont, Geneva, and a few other Hans-Towns in Germany; which are all of them in the whole World. And their Rise not above 150 Years ago. So small a Proportion do these Modern Dissenters from Episcopacy bear, either as to Antiquity or Numbers, to the Episcopal Churches of the World; without Reckoning those of the Romish Communion; who are indeed the greatest opposers of Episcopacy. Reducing it all to the See of Rome; which onely they term Apostolical. But all these, and all the other Dissenters above Nam'd together with them, will not amount to a Tenth part of the Number of those in the Communion of the above Nam'd Episcopal Churches, none of which ever own'd the Supremacy of Rome, except Denmark and Sweden, who have, with us, thrown it off. And all these

the Church of England do's own as Churches, and each of them as Members of the Catholic Church: And no one of them do's assume to her self the Title of THE Church. None but the Church of Rome, and the Quakers. If any other of our little Dissenters do assume this to themselves, we will give them into the Bargain. But I believe there is none of them will Pretend to it.

And now since T. E. does own that a Gather'd People, and not Particular Persons (however Holy) is the Common and true Notion of a Church, I wou'd Gladly be inform'd where the Quakers do Place the Church before G. Fox? Or was there no Church of Christ before? Did it quite fall out of the World? And were Christ's Promises defeated, which said, that it should never Fall, on the Gates of Hell prevail against it? If he says, That there were particular Persons, in all Ages, of their Principles.

They can show none such, except the vilest Hereticks, who were condemn'd by the whole Catholic Church.

But say, This, if it could be prov'd, would not do their business; Because T. E. has here confin'd the Notion of the Church to a gather'd Body of People.

Then either there was such a Gather'd Body before G. Fox, which the Quakers are oblig'd to shew, or otherwise there was no Church of Christ before G. Fox: or otherwise the Quakers are not THE Church now: Because they have separated from All other Gather'd Bodies of Christians in the World. It is left to the Quakers Choice, which of All these Absurdities they will stand under; for it is impossible to avoid them All.

If they think to Answer (which is no Answer), That this is like the Question which the Papists do ask at us, Where was your Church before I. I. I. H. E. R?

This is not, where THE Church was? And if the particular Church of England were lost, as the Seven Famous Churches to whom St. John wrote in the Revelations (and she has no more Promise than they), yet THE Church is not lost, of which she is but One Member: And All the above nam'd Episcopal Churches, who never submitted to the Pope of Rome, are abundantly sufficient to Repel that Frivolous Objection of the Papists, as if there had been no Church of Christ before Luther, except only the Church of Rome. But to the Quakers, who make Themselves Only to be THE Church, this is an Inviacible Argument: And they will never be able to struggle from under it.

And it is to be observ'd how the Papists and the Quakers are alike involved, by this Contradictory Pretence of setting up a Particular for the Universal Church. Christ has promised to his Church, That it should never fall, or fall from the Faith, i. e. He will always preserve such a Church somewhere or other: But the Promise is to no Particular Church. Now when a Particular Church arrogates to its self the Title of THE Church, it is consequential to this, That she should set up for Infallibility too: which

Which *Rome* and the *Quakers* ONLY have done (and it obstructs both in turning from their *Errors*) who ONLY have assumed that *Presumptuous Title* Which whoever does, as *Gregory the Great* said is a *Lucifer* for *Pride* and the *Forerunner of Antichrist*. This the *Papists* and the *Quakers* have to divide among themselves. And the Contradiction of the *Stille Roman-Catholic* i. e. *Particular-Universal*, is as *Applicable* to A *Quaker Church* for THE *Church*.

Here, by the way, let me shew the *Extensive Charity* of the *Church of England*, and other *Episcopal Churches*, above that of *Rome*, and of these *Narrow* and up-start *Dissenters*; who would confine the whole *Church of God* to themselves. But as *St. Cyrian* said of the *Bishop of Rome*, *That while he sought to thrust other CHURCHES from him: he only thrust himself from the CATHOLICK CHURCH*; So have these, in a much more plain and open manner; and with such *Absurdity* as is *Loathsome*. To hear such an *Ignorant* wrote as *Solomon Eccies. a Prophet and great Preacher of the Quakers*, say, the *Quakers* are in *Truth*, and none but they! Which *T. F. Repeat*, p. 212. (Being objected by *G. Keith*) and gives no other Answer, but *I have not seen that Paper, that I remember*. But passes no *Censure* or *Reflection* upon it.

If the *Quakers* should say, That their *Charity* is as *Extensive* as that of the *Episcopal Churches*, which extend the *Notion of The Church* only to themselves: And the *Quakers* do it to themselves. Let them consider how far theirs is extended, viz. To a few in *Pennsylvania*, and some other *Colonies of the West-Indies*, which, besides the *Quakers* here at home, are all the *Christian Bodies* they have to brag of; Except a very few, and *Inconspicuous* in *Holland*; and much fewer in one or two places in *Germany*. But let them all come in, they bear not the *Proportion of a Mole* to a *Mountain*, to the *Episcopal Churches*: which are all the whole *Christian World* except a small parcel of *Wen or Warts*, which have lately grown to the *Body of the Church*, in these *Western Parts*. But then again: The *Charity of the Present Episcopal Churches* extends backwards, to all the *Age of the Church*, ever since *Christ*: For all these have, every where, and always been *Episcopal*, without one *Exception*, till of very late years, and only in this *Corner of the World*. But the *Quaker Charity* can extend no further Backward than *G. Fox*, in the year 1650, but no age: For, before that time, they cannot pretend to any *Gather'd Body of People*, that ever was in the *World* of their *Principles* or *Persuasion*. So that this *Comparison*, lets them see their *Diminutive Novelty*, and ought to turn their *Faces* from whence they came.

XI. Page 213. There is a dispute concerning a very offensive Passage in *W. P.'s* *Rejoinder to J. Faldo*, p. 310. Which *G. Keith* says is *Non-sense*, or *Anti-Christian Doctrine*, as being Intended to take away the *Human Body of Christ*. For which *G. Keith* says that *W. P.'s* words, which follow, are given for a Reason, viz. *Because, that Flesh of Christ is called a Vail*, &c.

in *himself* within the Vail, which is the Holy of Holies, whereas *Christ* Jesus our High Priest hath entered, Heb. X. 20, 21. I confess, the words are obscure. Nor do I well understand the meaning of *Christ's* entering within his own High, which is the Vail; and then within himself, which is the Holy of Holies. It seems to bear this meaning, that as the High Priest, having entered through the Vail, left it behind him; so that *Christ* hath left his Body behind him, having passed through it, into the Holy of Holies. Which G. Keith says, one Robert Young, a Preacher among the Quakers in Pennsylvania, Did assert, and brought these very words of W. P. to confirm. Which T. E. p. 215. Does not deny, but says, there ought to be some other Voucher besides G. Keith. However, this Sense of the words is agreeable to the General tendency of that Book, which is to Depreciate the *Outward*, in Comparison of the *Inward Christ*, or *Light within*; otherwise there could have been no difference between W. P. and J. Faldo, who did not deny, either the *Divinity* of *Christ*; or the *Inward Influence* of his *Blessed Spirit* in our *Hearts*. Yet T. E. gives this Excuse for these words of W. P. That they were given as a Reason (among others) why the *Body of Christ* which was Nailed to the Cross, simply consider'd by it self, and Abstractedly from that *Divine Life and Power* which dwells in it, should not be called the *Christ*.

This makes the matter look much worse against W. P. than any thing G. Keith hath said. For it is certain that J. Faldo never said any such thing, as that the *Body of Christ* simply consider'd by it self, (which T. E. has put in here, in a different Character, to shew that he laid the stress upon that Limitation) and Abstractedly from the *Divinity* of *Christ*, was the *Christ*. No Christian could say or think any such thing. And therefore it was against something else, which W. P. disputed against something where-in J. Faldo opposed him; which was, in asserting the outward *Body* of *Christ*, against the Quakers Notion of turning it all into an Allegory of the *Light within*. And (as Robert Young, a fellow Preacher of W. P. understood his words above Quoted) they were intended, that *Christ* had Passed through, or got within the Vail, i. e. of his *Body*; and so left it behind him, when he went beyond it, into the *Holy of Holies*. If this was not W. P.'s meaning, let him clear himself from this Defence of T. E.'s, which will not admit of any other Construction to be put upon it.

XII. G. Keith Quotes W. P.'s *Truth Exalted*, Reprinted. An. 1671, p. 13. 14. But T. E. throws it off, p. 216. in this slight fashion, That neither deserves nor needs any other Answer here, than a bare denial. This made me suspect something, and to look into the place; where W. P. is describing the *Quakers Christ*, as he calls it; which he does at great length, several Pages together, and from Top to Bottom, not one word of the outward *Christ*, but applying the most express Prophecies of him, to that *Christ* or *Light within the Heart*. Unto us (says he, p. 13.) The most Afflicted, Despised, and

Forfeaken by all the Families of the Earth, in a Child Born unto us, a Son He Given, we call him Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, &c. and p. 14. This is the Second Adam, the Quickning Spirit — The Law writ in the Heart and Spirit, put in the Inward Parts — This is the Quakers Christ. And p. 15. — This Universal Light — is God's beloved Son, bear ye him.

XII. Page 17. T. E. to save W. P. from having Sworn, by saying, As sure as the Lord Liveth, and yet Condemning that Form, As the Lord Liveth, for a direct Oath, confesses, this Latter to be an Oath, but not the Former. This is very Nice! But if T. E. (the Doctor subtilis of the Quakers) had not Inform'd our understanding, any Dull Reader would have been apt to think, that the Former had rather been the Greater Oath, as being more Positive; but cou'd never have seen how it cou'd have been not onely less, but no Oath at all; because it is the very words of the Latter, and every word of it, onely adding, as sure as, to it. But what was the occasion of W. P.'s using of these words? They were the severe Sanction of a Prophecy, which (in his Book call'd Reason against Railing, p. 180.) he gave forth against Tho. Hicks, a Baptist Preacher; his opponent, in these words. So sure as the Lord Liveth — And I resisty to thee from God's Living Spirit, if thou desist me, and come not to deep Repentance, the Lord will make thee an Example of his fury, and thy Head shall not go down to the Grave in Peace. (To this, says T. E. p. 218. That he (Tho. Hicks) Desisted is certain; and that he did not come to Repentance, I suppose G. Keith will not adventure to say. This is in Justification of W. P.'s Prophecy, as if it had been thus Fulfilled, or solved. First, By Tho. Hicks's having Desisted; i. e. From opposing the Quakers. Which T. E. says, is Certain. Secondly, By his Repenting for it; which he says onely that he has Heard. And W. P.'s Prophecy being Conditional, and these Conditions of it thus Perform'd, it saves his Prophecy from being a False one. But First, as to T. Hicks's DESISTING to oppose the Quakers after this, which T. E. will not have us to Doubt, because He, even He himself says, It is certain. Whereas the Contrary is most certain. And I can give a most certain Demonstration of it. For T. Hicks did not Desist, but, after all this, he Printed an Answer to this very Book of W. P.'s, wherein this Prophecy is; and at the end of his Post-Script, he takes notice of this same Prophecy, and says, That if W. P. were his Judge, he believ'd that he wou'd make good his Prophecy, and my Head (says T. H.) Should not have gone to the Grave in Peace. This Book of T. Hicks's is intitled, The Quakers Appeal Answered, And Printed 1674. Well, but T. E. may say, that he Desisted when he had Done. Most likely i. e. He did not continue Writing to the last moment of his Life. But did his Head go down to the Grave in Peace? Yes. And was he not made an Example of God's Fury? Did he dye in Despair? At least so, as to be an Example! Which must be Publick, and Notorious, to those about him, when he Dyed; otherwise it was no Example. No. There was nothing at all

an *Extraordinary* in his *Death*: But to all *Appearances*, he *Died in Peace*, and with *Comfort*: And gave not the least *Sign* of *Repentance* for the *Opposition* which he had made against the *Equality*: And here I cannot refrain to say one Word to Mr. *Pennington*: That he would seriously Reflect upon the *Blessed* *Diaphany* of giving forth *Day*, in *The Name of the Lord*: May, tho' any thing of his *Prophecy* had befallen *T. Hicks*, yet it had been no less *Blasphemous*, and a *False Prophecy* in *W. P.* if it was not *Positively Revealed* to him by *God*, in *Some Extraordinary* manner; And in some *Other* way, than the *strong Impulse* of his own *Imagination*.

But he was carry'd into this by the *Common Track* of the *Quakers*, whose constant custom it was, and seen in all their *Writings*, to *Publish* all their *Claims*, as the *Immediate Word* of the *Ever-Living God*. And (as *W. P.* here) to *Put* the very *Being* of *God* for the *Truth* of their *Delusions*: That *As sure as the Lord Liveth*, what they deliver'd should so come to pass. And tho' such of their *Predictions* have 1000 times been *Defeated*, and *Proved False*, yet this is no *Mortification* to them; But they *Persist* still in the assurance of their own *Infallibility*: Can such an Instance of *strong Delusion* be given, ever since the *World* began? Pray *God* to open their *Eyes*, that they may, at last, *Consider* of it, as they ought; And recover themselves out of this *Snare* of the *Devil*, wherein they are taken *Captives* by him, at his will.

XIV. Page 218. 219. Some *Contradictions* of *W. P.* are *Disputed*, which I pass by, in this place, because their *Dollrines* is the subject which I now *Pursue*: And would not *Interrupt*.

What follows of *T. E.* Answer is in *Vindication* of himself from *Charges* laid against him by *G. Keith*. Which are, for the most part, upon the same *Heads*, which have been already *Considered*: And his *Defence* of himself, is after the same fashion as he has defended *W. P.* and *G. W.* by always *Perverting* the *Question*; and imposing *False Positions* upon his opponents, that he may seem to *Confute* them; and hide his own *Principles* the while. Of which method having seen so much before, I will, to save *Repetition*, but offer you a *Taste* here, to *verify* the *Character* I have given of him. And to ease the *Reader*, who, if he be not already *Tyred*, I am sure I am, therefore I shall beg leave to *Contract*.

XV. Page 220. 221. The *Charge* against *T. E.* is, That he deny'd the *Blood* of *Christ*, which was shed after his *Death*, by the *Spear*, to be any Part of the *Sacrifice*; from this Reason, because, he said upon the *Cross*, *Confession* *was finished*. Whence *G. Keith* Infer'd, That *Christ's Death* must be excluded by the same Rule, because that was after he had said *It is Finished*. No, says *T. E.* That cannot be charg'd upon me, because I said, that *Christ* had *permanently* *Finished* *his* *Work*, *and given up the Ghost*, before he was pierced by the *Spear*. This was only to free himself from the *Consequence* of *Excluding* *Christ's Death*, from being a Part

of the *Sacrifice*; which it does not. For if, *It is Finished*, was meant of the whole *Sacrifice*, then it was *Finished* before his *Death*. But however T. E. says nothing, in Excuse of his Excluding the *Blood* shed after his *Death*. Therefore that stands still Excluded by him, without any Defence.

And this does exclude the *Whole and Intire Sacrifice*, to which Christ's last Words, *It is finished*, are not Extended: but only to All that he was to do and suffer before his *Death*. For as the *Bodies* of the *Legal Sacrifices* were *Burned*, that is, *sacrificed*; and their *Blood* offered, *After the Death* of the *Beasts* which were *Sacrificed*; so was it in *Christ*, whom they *Pre-figured*; his *Body* pierced and his *Blood* shed, after his *Death*, were *Truly and Properly a Part of the Sacrifice*, as much as what he suffered before he *Expired*. And as the *Legal Sacrifice* was not completed by the *Death* of the *Beast*; but by the *Burning* of it, and offering of the *Blood* afterwards shed. And those who Reject *That Blood*, do mutilate his *Sacrifice*, and render it ineffectual to themselves.

So was not
Christ's
Sacrifice complete
By his Death
But by his blood
afterwards shed

XVI. Page 223. T. E. is charg'd with these Words, *I deny that Christ came by Generation of and from the Properties of Man or Mary*. This takes away the *Human Nature* of *Christ*. T. E. says, p. 225. he meant this only as to *Christ's Divine Nature*: Which is *Non-sense*. And none ever said, That his *Divinity* was *Generated of the Properties of Man or Mary*.

XVII. G. Keith brought a Quotation out of T. E.'s *Truth defended*, p. 138. wherein he said. That *Jesus the Saviour was not Created*. T. E. Answers here, p. 126. That this *Arose from hence*, that he (G. K.) *would make the Manhood only to be Christ, without the Godhead*. Which G. K. was far from saying. Nay, but the page before, p. 225. T. E. owns that G. K. *Had Confessed not to the Manhood only, but the Godhead and Manhood United*.

Therefore, it is plain, that T. E. meant to exclude the *inward or Created Christ*. And places all upon the *inward Christ*, or *Light within*, which he says, *was not Created*. i. e. upon *Christ a God only, but not Man*.

XVIII. This will appear further in what follows. T. E. said, in the same Book, That *Christ is the Great Cause of Regeneration and Sanctification, Chiefly as he is Manifested Inwardly in the Heart*.

This is to Prefer his *Inward* to his *outward Appearance*; and to his *outward Birth, Death, &c.* And *Tas* is as *Absurd* (says G. Keith) *As to say, the Beams of the Sun that Descend on the Earth, are the Chief Cause of the Earth's Fruitfulness; and not the Sun itself that is in the Firmament*. T. E. Answers, p. 126. *As if Christ (says he) were no otherwise in the Saints, than the Sun is on the Earth, viz. by its Beams*. This shews us the Heart of the *Quakers*, who are not satisfied with the *Influence and Inspiration of Christ*; But will have the very *Person of Christ* within them. And acknowledge no other *Christ* now in being. It is the *True and Real Christ* and *Light of the Sun* which is convey'd to us in its *Beams*. And it is the *True and Real Person and Light of Christ*,

(18)
Christ, which from him, in *Heaven*, is convey'd into our *Hearts*. And what more would the *Quakers* have? Nothing less than the very *Body* and *Person* of *Christ* within them! This is the *Foundation* of all the *Quakers* *Errors*. Whereby they pass over the *outward Birth*, and *Sufferings* of *Christ*, as so many *Facile Representations*, and *Historical Transactions*: But place all the *Merit* and *Salvation* in their own *Light within*, which they think to be the only *True, Real, Substantial*, and *Personal Christ*; and that there is none other.

XIX. What follows in the 3 next pages, which are the last of *T. E's Answer*, is nothing but some *Personal Reflections*, and *Vapourings*, wherein none but themselves are Concern'd. Therefore I leave them. Having omitted nothing, I think, that is *Material* in *T. E's Answer*, which Concerns the *Principles* of the *Christian Religion*; which only are my Concern, in this matter; otherwise I had neither put the Reader, nor my self to any Part of this Trouble.

Pray God it may Answer the End for which it was Intended, that is, to Perswade those who wield their *Pens* amongst the *Quakers*, to Contend no longer for vain Victory; or to Buoy up their own Reputations: That they would not mis-spent their *Wit*, and their *Time* to *Gloss* and *Cover* their *Errors*; which does but Expose them the more. And since they now do pretend, in Discourse, and otherwise, to be the same with the *Church of England*, in *Faith* and *Doctrine*; that they would, with a *Noble* and a *Christian* Courage, *Faithfully* and *Above-board*, *Retract* and *Condemn* whatever they have said or wrote to the Contrary. This is Incumbent upon them; to Rescue the many Souls Deluded by them. For that they are so Deluded none can deny. I have many times heard several of them, some of their *Preachers*, plainly own all the *Gross* things Charged upon them; even Denying any *Merit* or *Salvation* by the *Blood* of *Christ*, which was *outwardly shed*: That *Christ* is now a *Man*: That there will be any *Resurrection* of our *Dead Bodies*; or *Future Universal Judgment*. Now where did they Learn these *Doctrines*? There are none of any other Communion, who believe, *few* that ever heard of such things. Therefore it is certain, that these have been Deluded. And who have Deluded them? And nothing will undeceive them, but seeing their *Leaders* downright *Retract* these *Errors*. While they seem to exhort them, they Confirm their Ignorant *Follower*s in them. Whose *Blood* will be requir'd at their Hands, if they do not all that is in their Power, to re-trieve them. What shall I say more? To my *Persuasions* I will add my *Prayers* for them. Which I do daily offer for their Conversion. And thus to God, and his *Mercy* I leave them: through *Jesus Christ*, who shed his *Blood* for them; *Died*, *Rose*, and *Ascended OUTWARDLY*, and will, in the same *Body*, come again to Judge them: In which Day, may they hear a favourable Sentence from *Him*; and, with us, be one with him to all Eternity. Amen.

When I find a Quaker, who is not only Chargeable with what he has wrote in this Answer, which has been Examined, but the whole Body of the Quakers (except Turners-Hall and those in Communion with them) because it has been approved of by The second days Meeting (as all Books are that they give forth) which is their Supreme Authority, in such Cases.

Looking over his Answer again, I cannot but Remark a Bold Stroke of his, p. 34. Thomas Danson, being a Presbyterian Minister (said G. Keith) did Flead, that Christ, as Man, had a Created Soul. Nay, hold there (Replies T. By Thom. Danson spake of the Son of God, i. e. That Christ is not the Son of God)

If he thinks to come off by that Limitation in Danson's words, As Man, so will not Rescue him. For even, As Man, He was The Son of God, Luke 10. 35. And as to his Eternal Generation, He was the Son of God from all Eternity. Therefore T. E. is to tell us, in what sense he oppos'd Christ's being The Son of God: And with the assurance of a Nay hold there! As if some great Absurdity had been coming upon him!

II.

I. I told you, in my Conclusion, of the great Ignorance of the Generality of the Quakers: And that many of them, do, at this day, plainly own the most Blasphemous and Heretical Doctrines, which have been objected against them. And thence I infer'd, that, whatever Face their Writers, since the late Controversy against them, have put upon their Principles, yet this shews undeniably that such Heresies have been taught amongst them; and are

H

Still

(2)

still so understood by their People. And that *vehemently*. A present *Franklin* of theirs, not long since, being Pressed to acknowledge the Man *Christ*, without us, and the necessity of *Faith* in him. Answered, *The Man Christ*, a *F—rr*. Horrid! It Astonishes, to Repeat such disdainful *Blasphemy*! Tho it be necessary towards undeceiving of the World. I know the Man, and to whom he said it. He deny'd before me, and several others, at another time, That *Christ's Body* Rose out of the *Grave*: That our *Bodys* should *Rise*: That there would be any *General Judgment*: Or that the *Scriptures* were all *True*. This is a *Teacher*: Thus he has been *Taught*: And thus he *Teaches* others. And it is no wonder, that they who are thus *Taught* to believe no *outward Christ*, now in being, should use him with the utmost *Contempt*; And his *Worshippers* with the greatest *severity*; as being the grossest sort of *Idolaters*, to worship a *Dead God*, who is no more in *Being*. But the *Quakers Faith* is in an *Inward Christ*, *Viz. Their Light within*. And *Inward Blood*, *Inwardly shed*, &c.

2. Can outward Blood Cleanse the Conscience? Says *Isaac Pennington*, in his *Questions to the Professors*, p. 25. Was it the *Flesh and Blood of the Vail*, or the *Flesh and Blood within the Vail*? I have before observed, that they call *Christ's Body* the *Vail*, or *Garment* which he wore, without taking it into his own *Nature*, or being any Part of *Christ*. For say they, in a Book Compos'd by a great Club of them, Intituled, *Some Principles of the Elect People of God*, in *feorn* called *Quakers*. Printed. 1671. p. 116. The *Scriptures* do expressly distinguish between *Christ*, and the *Garment which He wore*; between *Him* that came, and the *Body in which He came*; between the substance which was *Vailed*, and the *Vail that Vailed it*—There was the outward *Vessel*, and the *Inward Life*. This we certainly know (say they) and can never call the *Bodily Garment*, *Christ*. So that the *Blood of Christ's Body*, was none of *His Blood*, it was but the *Blood of his Garment* or *Vail*; which the *Quakers* do not acknowledge to be *Christ*. And which *Isaac Pennington* says, cannot Cleanse the *Conscience*. What *Blood* then is it which *Cleanses*? Not the *Blood of the Vail*, that is, of *Christ's Body*, but *The Flesh and Blood within the Vail*, i. e. of the *Spirit*, which was within *Christ's Body*. And this *Spiritual Blood*, must be *Spiritual*, that is, *inwardly*, and not *visibly shed*. This totally excludes the *outward Christ*, and the *outward Blood* from having any *Efficacy* towards our *Salvation*. Which *Isaac Pennington* explains yet fuller: (*ibid*) Was it (says he) *The Flesh and Blood of the outward Earthly Nature*, or the *Flesh and Blood of the inward Spiritual Nature*? Was it the *Flesh and Blood which Christ took of the First Adam's Nature*, or the *Flesh and Blood of the Second Adam's Nature*? This is *Nonsense*, for *Christ himself* was the *Second Adam*; and this *Quest* is, whether he took *Flesh and Blood* of *His own Nature*? But by the *Second Adam* the *Quakers* mean onely the *Eternal word of God*, exclusive of the *Human Nature*. And they plainly here Exclude the *Flesh and Blood* which *Christ* took of the *First Adam's Nature*.

the Children had Flesh and Blood, and Christ took Part of the same, how was it made, or whether, simply as to the matter of Blood? Yet Thomas Ellwood, in his present Answer, when he would ward off the Consequence of Christ's Body being the same, in Substance, which it was upon Earth, and so a true *Human* Body still, which was urg'd upon G. Whitehead, crys out, in 205, As in a surprize, But bold a little! Did G. Whitehead ever call or own Christ's Body now in Heaven, or while it was on Earth to be Terrestrial, or of the Earth? P. calls it the *Earthly Nature*. And G. W. says, that it was the same with ours, as to the Essence or matter of Blood. Yet says T. E. where did G. W. ever call it Terrestrial, or of the Earth. Thus do these Men turn and wind their Hypotheses, at every Pinch. They cannot make it hang together. The truth is, They are Bewildered; and know not what they say.

The Quakers have an *outward* and an *Inward* Flesh of Christ. The *outward* they make nothing of, no more than of the *Flesh* of any other Good Man. But their Faith is in the *Inward* Flesh, i. e. Their *Light within*. And this onely is it, which, with them, do's take away Sin. G. Fox in a Paper, which he directs To all People in Christendom; concerning Christ's Flesh which was offered, &c. Printed 1671. p. 55. Sets forth, in a monstrous Jargon (for he cou'd Write no otherwise) this *Inward* Flesh of Christ as Crucify'd, &c. when Adam Fell. And in this Flesh (says he) is the Belief that takes away the Sin. This G. Keith objected. And says Thom. Ellwood, in his Answer, p. 207, That G. Fox there speaks of Christ according to the *Flesh* Crucify'd. And was not this his outward Flesh? Says T. E. What! That was Crucify'd when Adam Fell! This is too Gross (Thomas!) to put upon us. Then he says, he has not seen the Book, That he remembers, and knows not how faithfully G. Keith recites out of it. Tho G. K. said that he had the Book, and sets down G. Fox's words at Large. And p. 51. Of his Narrative, invites all that Pleas'd to see the Books, which he had Quoted, at his House. And if T. E. disdain'd to go, or send thither, he might, no doubt, have purchased a sight of that Book, many other ways. Which I (a greater Stranger to their Books) have done; And found the Quotation exact except one *Typographical* Error, *Viz.* *The Life Real*, which in G. Fox's Book, is *The Life Read*. An usual Cant among the Quakers, who cry often *Read within! Read within!* i. e. Harken to *The Light within*. And G. Fox, in this place, to let them know what sort of *Flesh* of Christ he spoke of; And what sort of offering of that *Flesh*, says, *The Life Read*, i. e. Read, or understand that I mean all I have said of the *Life* or *Light within*. But take the whole sentence. It is, p. 50. of Fox. Speaking of the offering of Christ, when Adam Sinned. So through this offering (says he) is the Reconciliation, through the offering of that *Flesh* that never-Corrupted, but takes away Corruptions, and his Blood Cleanseth from Corruptions, *The Life Read*. There is much more there to the same purpose, besides what G. K. hath Quoted. T. E. next Complains how hard it was for G. Keith, to fall thus upon his old Friend G. Fox; and tells how good an opinion G. Keith once had of him. Well! Let that Pass. I suppose he has alter'd his opinion, as of G. F. So of

G. W. T. E. and several others. And he has fully satisfy'd the World, that he had good Cause so to do. And I verily believe, that what he did was out of a Principle of Conscience: For he has got nothing by his *Charges*, but *Losses*, and great *Abuse*. The *Quakers* Prosecuted him for his *Life*, in *Pennsylvania*: And had not a New Governour (*Colonel Fletcher*) come there in-time, he had, in all Probability, been *Condemn'd*; the *Quakers* being both his *Prosecutors* and *Judges*: And since he came to *England*, He has been *Persecuted* with the *strife of Tongues*, *Excommunicated* and *Ruin'd*, as much as in their Power; who before did highly *Honour* and *Support* him. Nor has he put himself in any other way that might *Balance* these *Losses*. So that he has visibly gone against his *Worldly Interest*: And what other *Motive* could he have but *Conscience*, to Enable him in a *single War* against so *Many* and such *Potent Adversaries*? But he Fought for the great *Fundamentals* of the *Christian Religion*, which the *Quakers* had vilely cast away: And that *Spirit* which *Inspir'd* them, has *Arm'd* all their *Rage* against him. But the *Truths*, which he contends for has *Prevail'd* so far against them, as to force them to, at least, a *Feigned Compliance* with the *Doctrine* that he *Teaches*, which they *Pretend* always to have held as he now does: And thereby *Condemn* their *Excommunication* of him, as unjust; since they have *Publickly* at *Turners-Hall* Declar'd that they had no objection against him as to his *Morals*.

7. T. E. often calls upon G. K. for a *Reply* to his *Truth Defended*, which he wrote in *Answer* to a Book of G. K.'s call'd, *A List of Vile and Gross Error*, &c. But T. E. shou'd first have given a *Full Answer* to that Book; and to another Book of G. K.'s, call'd, *Gross Error and Hypocrisy Detell'd*, which T. E. pretends to Answer in this present Answer to the *Narrative*, Particularly p. 20, 21. Where G. K. disputes against this the very *Fundamental Error of Quakerism*, which is, Transferring the *Mrit* and *Satisfaction* of the outward *Sufferings* and *Sacrifice* of the outward *Christ* to their *Fancy'd Sacrifice* and *Sufferings* of the *Inward Christ*, or *Light within*. G. K. there produces their own words, as justify'd by W. Penn, G. Whitehead, &c. Viz. *Christ in us, offereth himself a Living Sacrifice to God for us; by which the Wrath of God is appeas'd to us.* And again: *Christ offers himself in his Children, in the Nature of a mediating Sacrifice.* To this, says G. K. (I will set down his words, because they are short and Material) *If satisfaction be really Exclud'd, which are W. P.'s words before Quoted; because a Sin or Debt cannot be both Paid and Forgiv'n, what need is there of a Mediating Sacrifice of Christ within Men, more than without them?* Secondly, *Seeing it is the Nature of a Sacrifice for Sin, that they be slain, and their Blood shed, how is Christ slain in his Children, and when?* For we Read in Scripture, that *Christ Lives in the Faithful*, as he did in Paul, but not that he is slain in them. Thirdly, *If we say the Life of Christ in them, by their Sins, doth not that hinder the Life to be a Sacrifice, by G. Whitehead's Argument; That the Killing of a Christ outwardly being the Act of Wicked Men, can be no Meritorious Act?* Fourthly, *Where doth the Scripture say Christ offers up himself in his Children a Sacrifice for Sin?* Finally, *Is not this to make more Sacrifices, or at least to say that Christ offer*

himself often, *Yes, Millions of* *contrary to Scripture, that faith, Christ*
offered himself once? Sixthly, Why could no Beast under the Law that had a
Alarmish be offered, but to signify, that Christ was to offer up himself in no other
Body but that which was without Sin? Seventhly, Why was it Propos'd of Christ,
A Body hast thou Prepared me, without Bodies many, if he offer up himself
in the Body of all the Saints? Eighthly, Is not this to make the Sacrifice of Christ,
in his own Body, of less value and Efficacy than his Sacrifice in W. Penn's Bo-
dy? Because the sacrifice in that Body which was offered at Jerusalem, was a
Type; but this in W. Penn's Body the Anti-Type; That the History, This the
Mystery (As he calls it in his Answer to John Faldo, p. 336. 337.) Ninthly,
Does not this strengthen the Papists in their false Faith, That Christ is daily
offered in the Mass and Un-bloody Sacrifice? Now T. E. in his Truth Defended,
p. 148. Falls upon defending W. P. for calling Christ but the History; and
the Light within the Mystery; after his usual manner, of making the matter
still worse: But very civilly slips all the rest, above Quoted, which is the
Jugular Cause, the very Heart of our Controversy with the Quakers: And
yet calls his Book an Answer to G. K. and Insults, because he has not got a
Repliation: But he must first amend his Long-short Answer: Or let him put
in an Additional Answer, as to the Nine Reasons above nam'd, against
their Inward Sacrifice: And then we will come with him, when he pleases,
upon the Merits of the Cause.

III.

1. I have before taken notice of the great Moderation and say'd Judgment
of the Quakers, in not Rashly passing Judgment upon any, without duly
and seriously weighing the Consequence of the Charge, and the Defence of the
Accused, and the utmost Good meaning that could be put upon words. Of
which T. E. shows a Remarkable instance, p. 124. of his Answer. Where,
in Return to G. K. who would have had them to have Censur'd, as Blasphemous,
that Doctrine of a Prophet of their own, Sol. Eccles. Viz. That the
Blood of Christ was no more than the Blood of another Saint. T. E. Answers,
That if G. Whitehead (to whom G. K. spoke) had been as Hot Heided as G.
K. perhaps he might: But that Blasphemy is an High Charge; and they that un-
derstand it aright, are not so Forward as G. K. (it seems) would be, to Brand
Persons with it, for every unsound expression. When I Quoted this above, I
laid before these Moderate Men, how freely they had Branded all the Chri-
stian World (for they have greater Tenderness towards the Heathen, whom
they make the next True Christians to themselves) as Apostates, Blasphemers,
Devils, Conjurors, &c. For making the outward Christ an object of their
Faith. I will now shew you, what other weighty Causes, they have De-
creed to be Blasphemy, Viz. Any opposition whatsoever made to Them, or
their Diana, the Light within. In a Renowned Book of theirs, Intituled,
The West Answering to the North. Printed. 1657. Containing some of the
Travels

Travels and Labours of their Fax Apostle, and other of his Cubs; there is set down, p. 1. *A Blasphemous Bawling Paper* of his, turning the *Christ* to the *Light* within; which will bring you (says he) off all the *Worlds Teachers, and Ways, and Doctrines*; i. e. Off all the *Doctrines and Teachers in the World*; All that Preach an *outward Christ*. Which Paper being justly call'd *Sinful and Wicked, Than which* (says the said Book, p. 12.) *What Higher Blasphemy is there, greater Abomination, or more Horrible Wickedness?* Take another Instance. One *William Rogers*, a *Quaker* of *Bristol*, happen'd to differ with the other *Quakers* about their *Womens Meetings*; Concerning Leaving *Friends* at Liberty to Pay *Tythes*, if their *Light* so directed; and some such other things; And he wrote a Book upon these Subjects, which he call'd, *The Christian Quaker*. Against whom one *Christopher Taylor* Wrote, what he styles, *An Epistle of Caution to Friends*, Printed, 1681. Where p. 4. he says, And for his Calling his Book, *The Christian Quaker, &c.* It is *Notoriously Blasphemous*. Now this *W. Rogers* was then, and is still a *Quaker*; And, at this day in Communion with them, and own'd by them as one of the *Friends*. But no matter for all that. If he touch upon the *Authority* of the *Quakers Inquisition*, or Plead for the *Original Freedom* of the *Light*, in *Particular Persons* (by which they throw off all *Lawful Authority*) against the *In-Errable Sanhedrim* of *Grace-Church-street*; if any, be who he will, Dare turn their Cannon upon themselves, it is *Notorious Blasphemy*! Or to Censure one word of *G. Fox's* *Infallible DiGates*, what *Higher Blasphemy*! What *Greater Abomination*! What *more Horrible Wickedness*! But if a *Friend*, who submits *Implicitly* to their *Church*; and will not dispute *Her Authority*, shall say, or Preach, or Print, That the *Blood of Christ*, is no more than the *Blood of another Saint*. And this shou'd be Tax'd as *Blasphemous*——O then, have a Care! *Blasphemy* is an *Heavy Charge*! And they that understand it aright, are not so Forward, as *G. K.* (it seems) wou'd be, to Brand Persons with it, for every unsound Expression! What one said severely of the *Church of Rome*, That there was but one Sin in her Communion, viz. To oppose the *Authority of the Church*. Is much more true of the *Quaker-Church*, which Asserts her *Authority* Higher; and requires a more *Implicite obedience*, than *Pope or Conclave*. So far are they gone from the *Original Principle*, by which they seduc'd Men from under all other *Church-Authority*, viz. The *sufficiency and Independency* of the *Light* in every *Particular Person*: And consequently, That all *outward Impositions* were *Anti-Christian*! But that *Principle* (like the *Fair Pretences* of *Usurpers*) is onely Calculated to Begin a *Rebellion*, and withdraw our obedience from those to whom it is due; Till they can get into the *Saddle*: But then, like *Scaffolding*, it must stand no longer. And such Deluded Subjects find (when 'tis too late) That they have Chang'd their *Masters*; But not their *Slavery*.

2. This will appear yet more, in the *Quaker* severity against those who dare to Speak or Write against them: who shall Presume so much as to *Countenance*, or, any ways, *Contribute* towards the least *Mutiny* or *Rebellion* from:

from their Authority. They fell upon the Printer, one John Barnard, a Quaker, who Printed that Book above-Nam'd of W. Rogers's; till he was forc'd to Sign a Condemnation of himself, for what he had done: Which he has Printed, and Prefixed, with his Name to it, to C. Taylor's, *Epistle of Caution*, mention'd before: And so made his Peace. But John Barnard, a Quaker-Merchant, who had sold some of W. Rogers's Books; And refus'd to sign such an Instrument of Condemnation against himself (according to their Discipline) because he had done it as the Printer too alledged before their Church had Censur'd it; And, being wrote by a known Quaker; And the Title of *The Christian Quaker* upon it; there was no Ground to suspect it. Yet all that wou'd not do, he must (without disputing) come under them; And Condemn himself, tho he thought himself Innocent: Which because he was not free to do, they, without more Ceremony Excommunicated him; and he stands still Excommunicated; ever since the 4th Day of the Eleventh Month, 1681. On which Day their Brethren Falmers bears Date, and was given forth from The Monthly Meeting, at Devonshire-House. And it bears no other Crime against W. B. But his selling of this Book; which they said was Prejudicial to the Truth, by Corrupting Peoples Minds, tending also to draw them into a Disesteem of many of the Lords Servants; &c. For it told of some of G. Fox's Tricks, and others: And, which was Intolerable, Play'd what he said. For which, The *Epistle of Caution*, above-nam'd, Part I. Says, mildly, *This Cursed Spirit of Satan is now entered into the Heart and Soul of W. Rogers, and such of his Abettors as own the Printing and Publishing of his wicked Book aforesaid, wherein he has Accus'd the Faithful Brethren at Large.* If he had onely said, That Christ was no more than another Man, he had come off, and been Excus'd by the whole Fraternity, and Reverenc'd, as well as Solomon Eccles: But to Level G. Fox with other Morals! Or touch the Faithful Brethren! To draw Men into Disesteem of these the Lords Servants! This was no less than Blasphemy! And to be Prosecuted without Mercy! And not onely Authors, but Printers, and Publishers, must be struck with their Ecclesiastical Thunder. But in Pennsylvania, where the Law was in their own hands, this did not serve turn: For there, they gave forth Criminal Warrants, Seiz'd and Imprison'd Printers and Publishers; of what was wrote against them: And improv'd it (like other Inquisitors) to a Design against the Government; and Try'd some of them for their Lives. But their Chief Governor being superseded, and Colonel Fletcher, a Church of England Man, coming in his Room, before they had run through all the Forms of their Process, he put a sudden stop to their Proceedings; and this has left us onely to Guess, whether all they did, was meerly out of Love; and but In Terrorum, to Fright their opposers into Better manners. However, some were Ruin'd by it; and William Bradford the Printer forc'd to Fly out of their Domains, to New York, where he now Lives. If you wou'd know what was the Cause of all this wrath. It was onely for Expostulating with them, whether their Granting Commissions, and Hiring Indians to Fight for

the Recovery of a *Sloop* the *Pirates* had taken from them, was not contrary to their formerly declar'd Principle of the *Un-Lawfulness* of using the *Carnal weapon*, tho in their own defence? This they construd to be an *Implicite Dis-Arming* the Government of the *Right or Power to Maintain* it self. And by this *Innuendo*, they Prosecuted *Printers, Publishers, &c.* As above is told. Of which there are full *Narratives*, and the *Tryals in Print*, Published by the Persons concern'd, to which I refer the Reader.

3. But tho they Guarded so severely against any *Printing, or Publishing* against themselves: Yet they refrained not to *Print and Publish* every day, most virulent *Invectives* against the other *Protestants*; and dispers'd them by order of their *Yearly Meetings*; for the *Propagation of Truth*, as they called it. And not onely what they cou'd do themselves against us; but they took pains to *Re-Print and Publish* the *Bitterest* and most *Venemous Darts* which the *Church of Rome* threw at the *Protestants*, especially of the *Church of England*. And that visibly with *Approbation*, and siding with them, against the *Protestants*. There was a Man of great Name among the *Quakers*, *Josiah Coal*, who wrote a Book call'd, *The Whore un-veiled*. Printed. 1665. Wherein he undertakes to prove the *Quakers* to be the *true Church* against the *Church of Rome*. But then having Conquer'd *Rome* (as he thought) he brings them in Aid with him against the *Protestants*; and borrows *Arrows* out of their *Quiver*, *Bare fac'd* and above-board. He *Re-Printed* a *Scandalous Libel* of one *A. S.* a *Roman Catholick* against the *Church of England*, and also the rest of the *Protestants*; which he says, he leaves them to Answer, *They, the Quakers*, not being concern'd. This *Libel* is Printed in a *Larger Character* than the Rest of his Book, to make it more *Conspicuous*; and is mention'd in his *Title Page*, that none might overlook it. It begins at p. 48. of his Book. And calls the *Protestant Clergy*, especially of the *Church of England*, in the compass of two Lines, p. 49. *Intruders, Thieves, and Robbers, Hypocrites, Ravenous Wolves, and Murderers, Sons of Belial, False Prophets, and Priests of Baal*. These are the very words of *G. Fox*, and the rest of the *Quakers*, the *sweet Appellations* which they bestow upon all the *Protestant Clergy*. And here we may see whence they have Learn'd them. Page 50. *That Senseless and Prophane Papist. A. S. Blasphemes our Holy Bible*: And describes the *Hypocritical Intruders* (so he styles our Clergy) *standing in a Pulpit or Tub*, (i. e. *Both Conformists, and Non-Conformists*) *with such a Brazen Fac'd Book, as is their unjust, Corrupt, and Perverse Bible in their Hand, Lulling the Poor Ignorant People to the sleep of Death, &c.* But are the *Quakers* concern'd at this *Intolerable and Blasphemous Contempt of the Holy Bible*? No. *Jos. Coal* Declares that they are not at all concern'd; on the contrary, he *Insults*, p. 40. In this *Home thrust* which he thought his *Confederate A. S.* had given to the *Sectaries* (thus he Insolently styles the *Protestants*) *their Bibles and Ministers, &c. Whose cause* (saith he) *I am not engag'd in, therefore it doth not Concern me to Answer his Charges against them, but leave them to Answer for themselves.* Now why shou'd these Men be Reputed as *Protestants*? They count them-

themselves none of us; who are not concern'd, on our Part, no not against the *Church of Rome*; But draw their Arms against us; who joyn with them, not onely against our *Ministers*, but our *Bibles*? Why shou'd these be Reputed as *Christians*? Can they be *Christians* who *Blaspheme* the *Holy Bible*? Or have they another *Bible* than ours? I wou'd earnestly Recommend to them that needful Caution, *Mat. VI. 23. If the Light that is in thee be Darkness!* And surely their *Light* within is *Darkness*, who joyn with the most *Ignorant* and *Bigotted* of the *Romish Emissaries* against our *Bible*; which the *Learned* among them do know not to differ, in any thing that is *Material*, from their own *Ful. Latin Translation*. And what are they but *under-journey-men* to *Rome*, who help out the Cry against the *Protestant Bible*? As if we had quite thrown off the *Bible*, or made a *New one*. Which, by these means, many of the *Ignorant* and *Implicite Papists* are made to believe; thereby to Create the greater *Abhorrence* in them against the *Protestants*. And the *Quakers* do joyn, in this, with these most *Wicked* and *Malitious* of the *Church of Rome*. And we must bear with them, in this; Tho they will not bear the least *Contradiction*, not onely to their *Doctrine*, but to the *Practises* of any of their Number, who Remain in *Unity* with their *Church*. There is an *Ancient*, *worthy*, and most *sincere*, *Honest Gentleman*, *John Penymann*, who had been *Inveigl'd* with their *False Shew* and *Pretences* to *Piety*; Remain'd *Zealous* in their *Communion*, and *suffer'd* with them, till he discover'd the grossest *Immoralities* among them, *Lying*, *Cheating*, and *Foul uncleanness*: Which having *Complain'd* of, and otherwise *Represented* to their *Superiors*; tho the *Facts* cou'd not be deny'd, yet wou'd they not *renew* any that continu'd in their *Unity*. For which Reason, he, after long *struggling* with them, to amend their *Scandalous vices*, at last *left* them; and has since, tho very modestly, detected some of them; which has *Provok'd* their *Rage*, past all Bounds of *Decency*, or *Christian Temper*.

See the *Post-Script*, to some of the *Quakers* contradictions; which he has Printed. 1696. P. 10.

They can find no better Names for him than *Grimming Dog*, *Whiffling Cur*, *The Devils Agent*, *The Devils Drudge*, *The Devils Porter*, *Vassal of Hell*, and *Cursed Serpent*, and *Bond-slave of the Devil*. And 100 other such *Complements*, which you will find in the Book Quoted in the Margent. They call him *Unclean Nasty Spirit*. Now he is the *Neatest old Man*, and the most *In-offensive*, I think, that ever I saw. And as far from the least *Tincture* of *Immodesty*, or any *Uncleanness*, as they are from *Sincerity* and *Charity*. But if he was the *Devils Drudge*, *Agent*, *Porter*, &c. for telling them of their *Immoralities*; are not they *Agents*, or *Drudges* to the same *Abaster*, at least to *Rome*, to *Vend*, *Publish*, *Re-Print*, and *Recommend* the most *Virulent* of their *Innovatives* against the *Protestants*, and their *Bible* too! To clap them on the Back, and *Holloo* them at us! Themselves unconcern'd: And *Rejoycing* in their *Victory* (as they think) over us! Approving of their *Arguments*, and making use of them against us! They Ex-
commu-

communicated J. B. for selling of a Book, which they thought might Tend to bring some of their Friends into Dis-esteem; As before is told. And do's not their Printing and Abetting of the Popish Scandalous Libels against us, at least Tend to bring us into Dis-esteem? Was it not, at least, some small sort of Dis-esteem to the Blessed Jesus, to make no more of His Blood than of the Blood of another Saint? Yet no Reproof, no Excommunication for that! How Tame is the Church of England, that suffers Fox's Journals to be Newly Printed, and Presented to the University of Oxford; and many other of the works of the Quaker Prophets to be Printed and Re-Printed, as oft as they please; which not onely tend to bring the Church of England, and all Protestants into Dis-esteem, but downright calls them False Prophets, Babel's Priests, Dogs, Wolves, Conjurers, Devils, &c. Nay, not onely this, but cast the utmost Contempt upon the Person of Jesus our God! Surely if the Church of England should Excommunicate and Prosecute such as either Printed, Published, or otherwise Encouraged the Quaker Books, which throw so much Dirt upon Her, her Doctrine, and her God, the Quakers cou'd not, by their own Rule, complain of it as any Persecution! Yet Complain they wou'd, and put it in the Register of their Sufferings.

IV.

I. In which there are many things as Groundless; and many downright Falshoods: Which it is very fit the world shou'd know. Because they take great Care to swell this Register; and have threatned to publish it to After-Ages (when the Facts cannot be disprov'd) whereby they hope to make their Sufferings for the Truth (as they call it) to exceed all the Ten Persecutions. And to be more un-deserv'd than the sufferings of Christ himself, or of the Apostles. As Edward Burrough (their second Pillar, next to the Great Fox) expresses it, p. 273. Of his works lately Reprinted (without Molestation) The sufferings of the People of God (says he) called Quakers, in this Age, is greater suffering, and more unjust, than in the Days of Christ, or of the Apostles — What was done to Christ or the Apostles was Chiefly done by a Law, and, in great Part, by the due Execution of a Law, &c. What a horrid Blasphemy is here cast upon the sufferings of Christ! I have before been put upon defending, not onely the Greek and Latin Fathers, but St. Peter and St. Paul, from the Quaker Imputation of being Lyars and False Witnesses of Christ; That they were Deceived, and expected the end of the World, in their Time. And now am I brought to Vindicate Christ our Lords from dying a Malefactor, i. e. Not onely by a Law, but by the Due Execution of a Law. This Law therefore must be either a Law of the Jews, or of the Romans. The Jews said, Job. XIX. 7. We have a Law, and by our Law, he ought to Die, because he made himself the Son of God. Now if this Law was Duly Executed upon Him, it must follow, that he was not the Son of God; Else he cou'd not suffer by that Law. And as to the Law of the

Romans, Pilate did Acquit him ; and wash his hands in token of his Innocency. So that he neither suffer'd by a Law, nor by The due Execution of a Law : Neither In great Part (as Burrough^{ously} Blasphemes) nor In any part at all. And the Case was the same with the Apostles. As St. Paul Pleaded for himself, *Act. XXV. 8.* Neither against the Law of the Jews, neither against the Temple, neither against Caesar have I offended any thing at all.

I hope this will be sufficient to clear our Blessed Lord, and his Ho^y Apostles from this Diabolical, and most Villanous Aspersions of Edw. Burroughs. And will let the World see the Luciferian Pride of the Quakers in Comparing, nay, Preferring their sufferings before the sufferings of Christ and His Apostles, by making their own sufferings to be more unjust, and more undeserv'd.

But what do the Quakers mean, by Insinuating as if they had not suffer'd by a Law? Were not all their sufferings for their Contempt and Breach of the Laws?

1. Their Chief suffering was for refusing to Pay their Tythes and other dues, which were Requir'd by Law ; and moreover declaring such Laws to be Anti-Christian, and not to be obey'd.

2. Many of them suffer'd (not so much as they deserv'd) for open and Notorious Blasphemy, As James Nailor, who was Hosannas'd, as the Son of God, into Bristol. Fox, Hubbertborn, Fell, &c. Suffer'd little or nothing for as wild Blasphemys, a Schedule of which G. Fox has Printed in his *Sand's Errand to Damascus* 1653. Which he design'd as an Answer to them ; but is indeed a Justification of them, as you may see more at Large in *The Snake in the Grass*. 1 Par. p. 210, &c.

3. Very many of them did Provoke sufferings to themselves on Purpose (being Proud of it) by their Obstinate and Perverse Behaviour to the Magistrates before whom they were brought ; Refusing to give any Account of themselves, some standing Mute ; others Bantaring in their Cant. As when one of them was ask'd his Name, he wou'd Answer, It is hidden from the World. Whence came you? Answer. From Egypt. Where do ye Live? Answer. In God: And the like: Which many Eye-Witnesses can declare. And some, when Boys (provok'd by their Exotick Figure, and Antick gestures) have thrown dirt at them, wou'd not stir one foot out of their way, but, making up their Mouths, stand stiff close by a Dung-hill, whence the Boys took their Artillery, till they were all over Besmear'd with Dirt : While others of them (some of whom told it to me) that walkt away from the Dung-hill, were not Pursu'd or follow'd by the Raguisht Persecutors: But were blam'd by the Nasty Confessors, for going out of the way of sufferings : Which, in their Register, will be made Equivalent to the Stoning of the Prophets.

4. Many of them were glad of being thus used, or Imprisoned, because they were better provided for, by the Large Contributions which the

Quakers

Quakers sent to them; than they cou'd have Liv'd otherwise: And, in a *Literal* sense, They *Fared* sumptuously every day. Which some that suffer'd with them in *New-Gate* can Witness. Several grew Rich, and made a good hand of their Confinements. I speak not of all. There is no doubt, but many of the Poorer sort of them, and in *Rem te* Parts of the Countrey, did suffer the Hardships of Imprisonment. For that was the Greatest of their sufferings. The Law did not make their offences to be Death; nor was it inflicted upon any of them. And their sufferings were mightily *Exaggerated*; and *Aggravated* without Measure. And the Accounts were sent into *Foreign Countreys*. Gerard *Croesus*, a Dutch Man, has Lately wrote a History of the *Quakers* in Latin. Which was Translated into English, and Printed at London this year. 1696. Where, p. 172. He tells of the Death (which he makes a kind of Martyrdom) of *Burrough* before mentioned, who, he says, was esteem'd by the *Quakers* as the Apostle of the *Londoners*. He says, That he Dy'd in Prison (which was false) That they put him into an *barrid Place*, full of Filth and Stench, and so Narrow, that he cou'd not well stand there; with which Miseries, after Eight Months, he falls Sick, &c. All which was likewise most False. For I know those who saw him, and were with him in *New-Gate*, where he was Prisoner; And he had a Clean, Convenient, and Handsome, Airy Chamber; as good as that place cou'd afford. Inasmuch that Sir *William Turner*, who was once Lord Mayor, and then an Alderman and Justice of the Peace, upon the Application of one whom the *Quakers* do now Count as an Enemy, went thither to see that the *Quakers* might not be ill us'd; and gave that Gentleman Liberty to Remove from thence such he thought were Prejudic'd by their Confinement: But coming among the Rest, to *Burroughs* Apartment; and finding it Sweet, and Pleasant, Sir *William* did Congratulate him, in these words, Mr. *Burrough*, The world is well mended with you, since I knew you first. Which was no small Mortification to *Burrough*, to mind him of his former mean Condition, before Company, he being then upon his Preferment, and Courting of a Rich Heiress. But however *Burrough* was Remov'd from thence; And did not Dye there, as *Croesus* Reports. Whether upon *Mis-Information*, or the Natural desire he had (being a *Presbyterian*) to Aggravate every thing which might cast a Reflection, as of *Persecution*, upon the King and the Bishops, against whom he Spits his Venom, upon every occasion: And lays the sufferings of the *Quakers* in England at their Door, as being of a *Persecuting Spirit*; But when he comes to speak of their sufferings in Holland (for they suffer'd there too) then he turns the Tables, and puts it all upon the score of their Perverseness, and Opposition to the Government. But my business is not now with him. I wou'd not lessen the sufferings of the *Quakers*; let them have their due weight; but I wou'd not have them Aggravated beyond the Truth. And it is here worth Notice, That the first difference betwixt Mr. *Pennyman* (before mentioned) and the *Quakers*, was the False Returns of their Collections from the

the several Countreys in England of the sufferings of the Friends: And Entering them, tho Prov'd to be False, in their General Register of sufferings at London. For this, they (to quiet Mr. Pennyman, and others, who Exclaim'd against this as a great deceit) made a shew, as if they wou'd turn off the Clerk of this Register, one Ellis Hook.

But he was supported by G. Fox; and continu'd; and no Rectification of their Register cou'd be obtain'd; being design'd for the service of Truth! Which some think can be Propagated by Lyes!

*Tho Rise
of the
Quakers*

2. Croesus makes the Quakers, and their Original much more Considerable than they deserv'd. The Fame of them, might grow Bigger in other Countreys. But here, where their Rise was, they are better known. Take a truer Account of them from one, not the meanest, among themselves, Isaac Penington, Famous in their Congregation, and a Man of Renown, in his Considerations concerning Israel, p. 3. he tells; that They were for the most part mean, as to the outward, young Countrey Lads, of no deep understanding, or ready Expression, but very fit to be despis'd every where by the wisdom of Men. How Ridiculous (says he) was their manner of coming forth and appearance to the Eye of Man! About what Poor Trivial Circumstances, Habits, Gestures and things; did they seem to lay great weight, and make great matters of Moment! How far did they seem from being acquainted with the Mysteries and Depths of Religion! But their chief Preaching was Repentance, and about a Light within, and of turning to that. Not minding to Answer or satisfy the Reasoning Part of Man, but singly minding the Reaching to, and Raising of that (the Light within) to which their Testimony was, &c. Here is not a word of the outward Christ! Nay, he Compares and Prefers this Light within to Christ. This, which he says, was so Contemptible to the world; which appear'd to fall so much short of the Dispensation of the Law of Moses to the Jews, much more of the Dispensation by Christ and his Apostles. Who wou'd have looked for the Lord Here! (Says he) And yet this, both the Lord Chosen to Gather his People; and to appear to the World in. This plainly gives that the Preference to the Dispensations of Moses, or of Christ.

But the Reader must know, that this whole Treatise is left out in the New Edition of Isaac Penington's Works, Re-Printed in a Large Folio, 1681, With Glorious Testimonies from G. Fox, G. Whitehead, and the Corona of their Chiefs, to the Memory of Isaac, as one of their greatest Ornaments. And tho all he wrote was from the Mouth of the Lord (Or else, by G. Fox's Rule, he was a Conjuror) yet did the Friends take upon them to Clip and Pair, and Rectify it, to suit with their Convenience. As they have serv'd all the Rest of their Prophets, whose works they have Re-Printed. Leaving out whole Baskets full of Hideous Blasphemys, and Treasons. All given forth In the Name of the Lord God Eternal: And some of them with Imprecations and Curses (wherein they are very Liberal) to those who shall add to them, or take from them. Tho if they were The word of God (as they Blasphemously Pretend) that Imprecation were Imphy'd, and the Curse, Rev. XXII.

19. Several Instances of this sort are given in *The Snake in the Grass*: Where, 2^d Par. p. 42, 43. there is a Letter Inserted of G. Fox's to Oliver Cromwell, in which he says, speaking of himself, *My Kingdom is not of this World*. And I am moved of God (said he) *To give this forth, from him whom the World calls George Fox, who is THE SON OF GOD*. Instead of which, in his *Journal*, p. 137. Where this Letter is Recited, he only says, *I set my Name to it*. And leaves out, *My Kingdom is not of this World*. So the Editors or Composers thought fit. For, whoever wrote it in his Name, it was Printed and Gilded after his Death. And yet there is Blasphemy and Nonsense enough left in it, to exceed any other Legend that ever yet appear'd. And as the Works of the great Fox himself, of Burrough, of Fisher, of Smith, of Houghton, and all their Great and Lesser Prophets, so must Isaac Pennington's too, pass thro' the Fire of the Quakers Index Expurgatorius, to leave several Scandals behind them, tho' all given forth In the Name of the Lord! Particularly this Treatise now mentioned: For it gives too true an Account of the Rise of the Quakers; and their Sottish Ignorance; Preferring their Light within to the Dispensation not onely of Moses, but of Christ, &c.

Isaac Pennington's Design in setting out the Rise of Quakerism, thus from young Country Lads, who were not only Grossly Ignorant of the Miseries and Depths of Religion, but who wanted Common sense, as well as Learning, or Expression; and therefore durst not Attempt the Reasoning Part of Mankind, (as he expresses it) but those onely who were as Ignorant and Besotted as themselves; I. P.'s Design, in this, was to turn it as an Argument that they were sent from God, because of the great Success they had, from such Contemptible Beginnings. And would make it Parallel to the Progress of the Gospel in the hands of the Apostles, who were Fisher-men, of no Education or Learning. It is true, they were so: But Christ, to shew his Almighty Power, gave them that Learning, by the Miraculous and Visible Descent of the Holy Ghost, which others attain by long study and Pains. He endowed them, at an instant, with the gift of Languages, which they knew not before, to enable them to Convert Foreign Nations. And gave them such Wisdom as their Adversaries were not able to withstand. They were Ready, at all times, to Render a Reason of the Faith which they Preached, 1st Pet. III. 15. But the Quakers matter not to Answer, or satisfy the Reasoning Part of Man. They Began in their Ignorance: And their Ignorance continues with them still. Of which it is not the least Part, that they see it not:

But dare compare themselves to the Holy and Inspired Prophets, and Apostles of the Lord. Some of them went to Convert the Pope, trusting that the Spirit would give them utterance, as to the Apostles. But when they came there, they could speak nothing but English; nor understood his Latin, or Italian; and so they Parted.

And as to their Progress, in these miserably divided Kingdoms, it onely shews the fatal Consequences of forsaking the Church (which was thrown down, before they set up) and how far God may Permit Delusions (for our Sins)

Sins) to spread. Of which *Mahomet* is a much greater Instance than the *Quakers*. But it may teach us this withal, That if a *Blind Ignorant Zeal* can do *such great Things*, how much more would a *Godly Zeal for Truth and Religion* Prevail!

Thomas Ellwood would turn all the *Vile Billingsgate-Railing* of the *Quakers* against the *Church of England* and others, into a *Pure Godly Zeal*. But *W. Penn* has very Justly Corrected any such Defence, in his *Address to Protestants*, 1st Edit. p. 242. and of the 2d Edit. p. 246. Where he speaks like a *Christian* and a *Gentleman*; thus: They that are *Angry for God, Passionate for Christ*, that call *Names for Religion*, and *fling Stones*, and *Persecute for Faith*, may tell us they are *Christians*, if they will, but no body would know them to be such by their *Fruits*: To be sure they are no *Christians of Christ's making*. *O. Keith*, in his *Narrative*, having quoted this, and objected *W. Penn's own Practice*, as very opposite to it, of which he gives some Instances, particularly in his *Guide mistaken*, Printed 1668. p. 18. Where he falls upon *The Idle Gormandizing Priests of England*, as he calls our *Clergy*, and says, That *No sort of People have been so universally, through Ages, the Bane of Soul and Body of the Universe, as that Abominable Tribe for whom the Theatre of God's most dreadful Vengeance is Reserved, to Act their Eternal Tragedy upon*. And in his *Quakerism a New Nick-Name*, &c. p. 165. he calls the *Dissenters*, *An Ill-bred Pedantic Crew, the Bane of Reason, and Pest of the World; the Old Incendiaries to mischief, and the best to be spared of mankind; against whom the Boiling Vengeance of an Irritated God is ready to be poured out*, &c.

These are *Terrible Words*! and very like being *Angry*. But *T. F.* says in his *Answer*, p. 219. That these Words did not proceed from *Anger or Passion*, but from a *Just and Godly Zeal* against *Deceivers and Deceit*. However, both the *Church of England* and *Dissenters* are much oblig'd to him for his moderate and *Charitable Opinion of them*! And Decently express'd, we cannot Deny! But which way soever they have deserv'd it from him, yet is not this *Calling of Names*? Is not this *flinging of Stones with a Vengeance*? If there be no *Anger or Passion* in this, what Words shall we find out wherein to express *Anger or Passion*? But I understood the Force of *Mr. Penn's Reasoning* to consist in this, That the *Calling of Names*, and in an *Indecent manner of Expression*, was a certain sign; that such a *Zeal* was not for *Christ*. But if, as *T. F.* excuses it, the most *Imbitter'd and Violent Expression* can come from a *Godly Zeal*, then is there no meaning at all in what *Mr. Penn* has said? And we may call *Names*, and *fling Stones* to the End of the Chapter, and still be good *Christians*, of *Christ's making*. But what is *Anger* in others, is *Zeal* in the *Quakers*; and so there's an End of the business.

But if the utmost *Fierceness* may be Excus'd upon Pronouncing a *Sentence of Damnation*, as here, and sending us together, *Church of England, Dissenters*, and

and All into the Bottomless Pit : And as such Reprobates we do serve no other Epithets, than Thieves, Robbers, Conjurers, Witches, Devils, Scarlet-Colour'd-Beasts, Blood-bounds, &c.

See *Satan's* in
the *Grave* in
Par. p. 32.

Yet can such Senseless and Childish Rattle, as Green-headed Trumpeters, Gim-cracks, Whirligigs, Moon-Calfs, Thread-bare Tatter de-Mallions, &c. Which the Quakers have bestow'd upon their opponents, can these too come from a Godly Zeal! Can their abominable Nasty stuff come from thence too, which would make one Sick to Repeat ! But I must venture the strength of the Readers stomach, to give him a little Taste of it, lest he shou'd not believe me. See a Book Printed by J. Wiggans, whom the Quakers had Provok'd to Dispute with them, which having Published, they Reply upon him thus : *This hath caused thee to spue out on a Piece of Paper for the Dogs to Lick up—And they take so much of thy Filthy spuing, that it causeth them to Vomit—Thou Purges upwards and downwards—Thou hast need of one to wipe thee—Thou makest a pitiful stink—Through thy Vomiting and Purging, thou Besmears every one that comes nigh thee—One may follow thee by the smell—Wilt not give over Vomiting—Thou stinks all the Countrey over—Like a Man with a Scal'd Head, and a Horse with a Gall'd Back—Making People Vomit and Spue.* And Margaret Fell (afterwards Marry'd to G. Fox) wrote to him thus : *Thou hast Committed Sacrilege, which will never be forgiven thee—Thou art Accursed, and no other Portion can thou have—Thou Infidel Child of Darkness—The Curse Christ hath Pronounced on thee. Thou art the Man. Thou Impudent Lyar, Night Owl, wicked Lyar, &c.* Now the cause of all this Rage, was his denying *The Light within to be Christ*; yet he own'd a *Light* to come from *Christ* into the Hearts of True Believers. This Marg: Fell, after she was Marry'd to G. Fox, became the Mother of the Quaker Church. She was then Past the Age of Child-bearing; yet he gave out, that she shou'd have an Isaac. And she grew Big; and Great were the Expectations; The time came on; All things Provided for the Lying in; The Midwife attended several weeks in the House: But all vanished and came to nothing. This Fox said, That his Marriage was a Figure of the Church coming out of the Wilderness; above the State of the first Adam, in his Innocency; in the State of the Second Adam that never Fell. I can produce one that saw a Quaker fall down Prostrate at the Feet of this Margaret Fox, and say, *O thou my Heavenly Mother, Pray to my Heavenly Father for me.* I have before Quoted G. Fox, where he says, *That whoever speaks a word, and not from the Mouth of the Lord, it is Conjuraton.* Now then, by this Rule, All the Rancorous, All the Senseless, All the Nasty, Beastly Expressions above Quoted, were from the Mouth of the Lord, or otherwise All those who spoke them were Conjurers. Will T. E. say, That they were all Acted, in this, by a Godly Zeal? Otherwise, by Dr. Penn's sen-

tence, they were *no Christians of Christ's making*. How Dreadfully Astonishing it is, to see Men father their Rage and Fury, their Effeminate senseless Billings-Gate, their very Nastiness upon the Holy Spirit of God! But I am glad to leave this subject.

VI.

1. I am come now to the Last point, and that is, to see how far the Present Quakers have Censur'd or Forsaken All these things, which have been objected and Prov'd against them.

Were they Convinced of them, and onely willing to come off without the shame of a Publick Retraction; but wou'd teach sound Doctrine for the Future: And Learn some more Decency (tho they hate Manners) in Expressing of themselves; which they have come to more of Late than Formerly; and with it have, in a great Measure, Abstain'd from that Furious Damning of all Christianity, in such Dreadful and Boiling Passion as they were wont: If they cou'd be Penitents, without being Confessors, in this Case, I shou'd be glad of all the Ease that cou'd be given them; and to let them Recover from their Errors with the least Pain. But where so Publick a Scandal has been given to the whole Christian World: Especially where so many of the Generality of the Quakers do still (as above shewn) stick in the very Bottom of that Sink of Heresies which they have been Taught; and are like so to stick, while they see their Leaders go about to Justify, to Excuse, and Palliate them: In this Case, there is an absolute necessity for them Plainly and Fully to Retract and Condemn these Heresies: And without this, there can be no True Repentance, without doing all that is in their Power to Draw those out of the Ditch, whom they have led into it. Were their Repentance sincere, it wou'd Provoke not onely a willingness, but a great Zeal to do this, to save those Souls whom they have misled: Without which they can never save their own.

But so far have they been from doing any thing of this, that on the contrary they have, in the most Solemn and Publick manner, that is Possible for them, Riveted and Confirm'd All that they have Taught, even from the Beginning. They have a Yearly, General Council, every Whitsun-week, in London, compos'd of Representatives from all the Counties in England, and either Deputies or Letters of Consent from all the Bodies of Quakers in the World. And every year, this Sovereign Authority of the Quaker-Church do's Issue forth, in Print, an Yearly Epistle (as they call it) Directed to All Quakers throughout the World, which is their Supreme Law, and counted Infalible with them. I have seen that of this Year 1696. Wherein mention is made of Deputies or Letters sent thither from Barbadoes Maryland,

ryland, West-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Bermudoos, Antigua, Holland, Ireland, and Scotland. And since so great a Schism was Risen in their Church, by the opposition chiefly which G. Keith gave to them, by Accusing them of such Gross Heresies as we have heard, it wou'd be Expected, That this their General Council shou'd give an ultimate Decision in this Controversy; which they have done, in Terms as full, as they cou'd, in Prudence, use, while the Contest was so Publick. But it is plain enough to be understood by all those for whom it is Intended, The Quakers are therein Requir'd to Hold up the Holy Testimony of Truth, which hath made us (say they) a People to God, and Preserved us so unto this Day; and that in all the Parts of it; For Truth is one, and Changes not; And what it convinced us of to be Evil in the Beginning, it Reproves still. These are the words of their Decree. And by this, we are as Evil, in their opinion, as ever we were; And the Clergy of the Church of England are still That Abominable Tribe, Baal's Priests, Wolves, Dogs, Bears, Devils-Incarnate, &c. But what they think of us is not so Material. But, by this, they are all as bad, who place their Faith, in the outward Jesus. For it is onely for this, that the Quakers have so Condemned us. It is for this that they say the Devil is in us All. As G. Fox said to Chr. Wade (Great mystery, p. 250.) The Devil was in thee, thou say'st thou art saved by Christ without thee, and so hast Recorded thy self to be a Reprobate. But we have seen enough of this before. And this which the Quakers call Truth, is not onely to be kept in the main, the great Branches of their Doctrine, but In all the Parts of it! Every Title of all of what we have already seen. For Truth is one, and Changes not: i.e. The Quakers have not Changed, in any thing, from that Truth which they Taught at First. Infallibility must not give way, no, not in a Circumstance!

2. But I have a Question to ask, which I know the sincerity of the Friends will not Refuse to Answer. Whether among the Quaker-Bishops who compos'd this their Last General Council, there was not one George Archer, by Name, a great Preacher in or about Wiltshire? Who this last year, having (out of Pure Zeal to Propagate the Truth) gotten a Woman with Child; to cover the Scandal, perswaded an Old Man to Marry her; and himself Performing the Priest's Office, Preach'd, at the Espousals, much in Commendation of the Bride. But she, not staying the Formality of nine Months, after her Marriage, and Teeming sooner, the Old Man complain'd to this Archer, who being assur'd of the Firmness of the wench; and to Remove all suspicion of himself, Pray'd that she might not be deliver'd of her Pains, till she discover'd the true Father. Which, beyond his Expectation, she did, and put the Saddle upon the Right Horse. And the Knaves of that Countrey getting this by the end, forc'd him to shift his Quarters; And he came up to London; to whom the other Quakers gave the Right hand of Fellowship: And there he Preached, and exercis'd his

Talent, with great Approbation : Till *Failing* in a *Worldly*, as well as a *Carnal* sense; he was put in Prison for *Debt*, since the last *Yearly Meeting*. Wherein whether he did not *Assist*, as one of the *Infalible*, the *Infalible Friends* will let us know. But, if he be not *Fail'd* in another sense, a *Prison* will no more cool his *Courage* than it did *Christopher Atkinson's*, another *Preacher*, *Prophet* and great *Author* of the *Quakers*, who wrote *The Sword of the Lord Drawn*, to cut down *Churches*, *Kingdoms*, and *Nations*; yet *Lightned* his *Heart* with *Thomas Symonds* his *Maid* in *Norwich Goal*. 1655. And none of the *Infalible* cou'd find it out, till himself confess'd it. You may see that sad story at Large in *The Snake in the Grass*. Par. 2. p. 89. &c. Yet none of these things, nor *Henry Winder's Quaker-witches*, nor 1000 other *Instances* can be given, does abate any thing of the *Quakers* Pretence to an *Infalible discerning Spirit*, to Judge all *Persons*, and all things, as well as *Magistrates*, *Kingdoms*, and *Churches*, which *G. Fox* Positively asserts, in his *Great Myst*, p. 5. 96, &c. And says, p. 89. That they can discern who are *Saints*, who are *Devils*, and who *Apostates*, without speaking ever a word. And *Edw. Burrough* in his *Epistle* Prefixed, p. 7. Extends this to all and every of the *Quakers*. To us (says he) every one of us in *Particular*. — And this *Light* gave us to discern between *Truth* and *Error*, between every *False* and *Right* way; And it Perfectly discover'd to us the true *State* of ALL THINGS. And whoever wanted this *Infalibility* of *Discerning*, the *Quakers* counted them *False-Ministers*, *Computers*, *Witches*, *Devils*, &c. This was their great *Charge* against the *Church of England* and others, That because they did not Pretend to this *Infalibility* of *Discerning*, therefore they were *False Churches*, &c. As *Fox* in his *Great Mystery*, p. 94. 107, &c. And all this, In all the *Parts* of it, this last *Yearly Meeting* has *Confirmed*.

3. But they support this not onely in words; they take care to have their youth fully *Tinctur'd* with the *Time Leven*. In their *Publick Schools*, it is Enjoyn'd that the *Scholars* shou'd Read such a *Portion* of that *Blasphemous Journal* of *G. Fox's*, every day. Particularly in their great *School* at *Wansworth*. The *Publick* ought to take some care of this, in *Pity* to their *Poor Souls*. And in *Private Families*, that odious *Journal* is daily Read, where the *Holy Bible* is suffer'd to Mould. And the *Travels* of *Fox* are more Read and Valu'd by the *Quakers*, than those of *St. Paul*, or any of the *Apostles*.

4. But to shew how their *Infection* does spread (if what I have said be not enough) I will give this further *Demonstrative Proof*, which has occur'd very lately. There is one *Thomas Curtis*, commonly call'd *Captain Curtis* (he was such in *Oliver's Army*) at *Reading*, a wealthy Man, and one of the *Quakers* of the most *Ancient* standing now among them; he has been

been a *Preacher* with them about 40 years, and so still continues: Has *suffer'd* and *merited* in their cause, as much as any. But is more *open-hearted*, and less *dissembling* than the Rest. He freely owns the *Doktrins* he has *Learn'd*; and which he always *taught* since he first engag'd amongst the *Quakers*; and carry'd it on with *Indefatigable Zeal*. He erected (or was chiefly *Instrumental* in it) a *Monthly Quaker Meeting* at *Kings-Heath*, in *Lamborne Woodlands*, in *Berkshire*, 25 Miles from *Reading*, it was call'd *Thom. Curtis's Meeting*. And *Preaching* there at their *Monthly Meeting* upon *Sunday*, the 4th of this *Oct. 1696*. He took notice of their *Present Divisions* upon Account of the *New Doktrine* (as they call it) which *G. Keith* had, of Late, *Broached* among them. And finding that some of that Meeting had a favourable opinion of *G. Keith* herein, and embraced his Principles, particularly one *William Clark*, he challenged him by Name, and any 5000 of that Party, to dispute with him. Whereupon *Will. Clark* did engage him. And there Publickly before them all, *T. Curtis* asserted, That *Christ had a Prepared Body*, but what is become of it, he knew not, neither (said he) do I care. Being ask'd whether *Christ had a Soul*? He said he knew not. Whether it was the *Godhead* or *Manhood* that *suffered*? He Answered, that he cou'd not tell whether it was the *Manhood*, or the *Godhead* that *suffered*. He said, There was no *Resurrection* but of the *Soul* from the *Dead of Sin*; and this (said he) I have often *Preached*, and do still maintain. He said, That *Paul got all the Resurrection while living in this World*. That he did believe his own *Body* shou'd be changed like unto *Christ's Glorious Body* while he was *Living in this World*. That he knew nothing of *Christ* but within himself. Being asked by *W. Clarke*, whether he did believe that *Christ* is in *Heaven*, without us, in the *Entire nature* of *Man*, of *Soul* and *Body*, the same for substance it was on *Earth*, *Glorify'd at God's Right Hand*. He Reply'd, This is one of thy *Quibbles*, I will not answer thee. And then asked, Where is *God's Right Hand*? Being again Demanded by *W. C.* Whether he had whole *Christ* in him? He Answered, I know nothing of *Christ*, but within my self. He said, That a man might be come to the *Resurrection*, and have the *Resurrection*, and yet not *Past*: i. e. That the *Resurrection* being once come, it *Remains*, and so is not *Past*. At which Rate it will not be *Past* in *Heaven* after the *Resurrection*. But this is a *Fetch* of the *Quakers* to make their *Denial* of the *Resurrection* appear not to be the same with that of *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, 2 *Tim.* 2. 18. With which it is the very same; and *St. Paul* calls it an *overthrowing* of the *Faith*. For he did not oppose them in the *State* of the *Blessed* after the *Resurrection*, being a *Remaining State*, and not to *Past* away: But in that they said the *Resurrection* was already *Past*, i. e. *Inwardly* obtain'd by the *Faithful*; and therefore no *After* or *outward Resurrection* of the *Body* to be expected.

3. *Thomas Ellwood*, in his *Answer*, before consider'd, p. 142, 143. Repeats these words, of *George Whitehead's* against our *Notion* of the *Resurrection*, viz. and their *Assertion* and *Determination* therein, is contrary to

what

what the Apostle saith, 2 Cor. V. For we know if our Earthly House of this Tabernacle were Dissolved, we have a Building of God, an House not made with hands, Eternal in the Heavens : For we that are in this Tabernacle do Groan, being Burdened, &c. But why would he close this with his &c. So soon ? For the very next words in the same ver. 4. would have set him Right, and Determin'd the cause fully on our side, viz. Not for that we would be un-clothed, but Cloathed upon ; that Mortality might be swallow'd up of Life. i. e. Not that we would be un-Clothed, or quite Divested of our Bodies ; but that a New Cloathing of Immortality should be given to our Bodies. The un-Cloathing is the Quaker Notion of the Resurrection ; The Cloathing upon is ours. T. E. by way of excuse says, p. 143. That G. W. wrote this against that Notion, That the Happiness of the Soul is not Perfect without the Body ; and that the Soul hath a strong desire to a Re-Union to the Body. This T. E. thought such an absurdity as that no Man would own it. Which shews how very far they have wander'd from the Truth, in this Doctrine of the Resurrection. For it is not disordred among Christians, but the Soul hath a strong desire to a Re-Union with the Body : And that her Joy is not Perfect, i. e. Compleat before that time. Which makes them Cry, How Long, Revl. 10. O Lord, Holy and Just ? And Pray, that God would Hasten his Kingdom, and Come Quickly. And the Quakers endeavouring to Ridicule this, as before is shewn, is a Proof, that they have more need of being Taught than Disputed against : And instead of meddling with Controversy, should be busied to Learn their Catechism. But to Return to Thom. Curtis.

6. The Account I have above given, and all the Particulars, I have seen under the hand of William Clarke, the Person Concern'd : And I am told, That a Narrative of the whole Proceedings of that Monthly Meeting, is like to be Published. In the mean time, the use I have to make of it is this, to shew that the Quakers do still hold these Abominable Heresies, and always have held them. Notwithstanding of the shuffling Excuses which T. E. G. W. and W. P. would now put upon them.

If it be objected, that Thom. Curtis is a Separatist from the Quakers of Grace-Church-street, and joyned with those of Harp-Lane : And therefore that those of Grace-Church-street are not Accountable for any thing he says or does. *Ans.* 1. Those of Harp-Lane are Answerable, and all in Communion with them. And my present business is to shew that these Vile Heresies are still Taught among the Quakers. *Ans.* 2. These of Harp-Lane did not separate from those of Grace-Church-street, upon any Principle of Faith or Doctrine : But meerly upon

a Possibility of Church-Disunion, in submitting to the Jurisdiction of the Wicked Ministers; and other Instances of O. Fox's Authority; and their new Ruling-Elders. But as to matters of Faith they are perfectly one: And as to all and every one of the Points which we have discuss'd. For which Reason, G. Keith has left *Harp-Lane*, as well as *Grace-Church-street*: And those of *Harp-Lane* are as violent opposers of him and the *Christian Doctrine* which he teaches, as the *Quakers* of *Grace-Church-street*: Therefore, as to matters of Faith (which we are now upon) *Thom. Curtis*, and all those of *Harp-Lane*, who join with him, are as Proper Instances, as if they had been all Pick'd out of *Grace-Church-street*. *Ansiv.* 3. If this be not True, let *Grace-Church-street* Disown *Harp-Lane*, as not holding the same Faith with them; or for any thing else but their *Breach of Union*, for the causes before told. But there is nothing else so much as Pretended betwixt them. They differ but as the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* in the Church of *Rome*, all one in the Faith, onely some disputes about their *Orders*.

VII.

And this Division of the *Quakers* concerning their Church Authority, tho it be not of so great Consequence, as the *Fundamentals* of Faith which we have debated: Yet it Involves them in as great *Absurdities* and *Contradictions* as the other.

Their Original Pretence was the *Sufficiency* and *Independency* of the *Light* within every *Particular Person* (as has been said) against all *Impositions* or *Restrictions* whatever, from any outward Authority. Which made *W. Pen.* in his *Address to Protestants* (p. 152. 2d Edit.) Interpret that Text, *Math. XVIII. 17.* Tell it unto the Church, to Relate onely to *Private Injuries* twixt Man and Man, and not at all to matters of Faith. This was when that Text was urg'd against the *Quakers* in General for their Defection from the Church. But in his Book call'd *Judas and the Jews*, which he wrote against the *separate Quakers*, there, p. 13. He brings this same Text full against them, and Argues from thence, That if in Case of *Private offences* betwixt Brethren, the Church is made *Absolute Judge*, from whom there is no Appeal in this World; how much more, in any the least Case that concerns the *Nature, Being, Faith, and Worship* of the Church her self? *T. E.* Endeavours to solve this Contradiction, p. 218. of his *Answer*. It having been objected by *G. Keith* in his *Narrative*. He wou'd put it off thus, That in *Judas and the Jews* *W. P.* onely meant to give the Church Power to Try and Reject *Spirits*. And that in his *Address to Protestants*, he onely deny'd Power to the Church to Define and Impose upon all People, under *Temporal* and *Eternal Punishment, Articles of Faith, &c.* And this, he says, is

no Contradiction. But *W. E.* is a *Sovereign Judge*, from whom there is no Appeal. And who is the *Sovereign Judge* of *FAITH* as well as of *works*. And who is the *Sovereign Judge* of those Big words which *T. E.* brings together to *Prove* us. And *Define* the *Question*? For an *Absolute Judge*, from whom there is no Appeal, must *Define*, *Impose upon all People*, &c. And if his *Power* reaches to *Matters of Faith* (as *Mr. Pen* says the *Power of the Church* does) then if *Matters of Faith* do Reach to *Temporal and Eternal Punishment*, the *Power of the Absolute Judge* must Reach to those Cases Likewise. And to make the *Church* such an *Absolute Judge*, by virtue of that Text, *Mark* xxi. 17. As *Mr. Pen* in his *Judas*, &c. And yet to say, as he does in his *Address*, &c. That this Text gives no Power at all to the *Church*, in *Matters of Faith*, but that it Relates only to *Private Injuries*, is full as *great a Contradiction* as before *T. E.* meddled with the *Definition* of it.

But having had occasion to consider this Passage of *Mr. Penn's* more fully, in my *Discourse*, *Proving the Divine Institution of Water-Baptism*, *Sec. X. Num. V. p. 42.* I will insist no further upon it in this Place. And tell the *Reader* the Good News, That I have done.

FINIS